DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 475 CE 039 926

TITLE Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983. Part II. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session (February 7 and 9, 1984).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE Feb 84

NOTE 134p.; For Part I, see ED 244 146.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adult Vocational Education; Career Counseling; Career Guidance; Cooperative Programs; Disabilities; Disadvantaged; Educational Legislation; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Industry; Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Postsecondary Education; Productivity; *Program Improvement; Retraining; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; *State Programs; Technological Advancement; Unemployment; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS Congress 98th; Productivity Improvement; Proposed Legislation; Special Needs Students

ABSTRACT

This is the record of two congressional hearings on H.R. 4164, the Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983, and H.R. 4793, the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984. Witnesses provided recommendations, reactions, ideas for improvements, and suggestions relating to these bills. Testimony includes statements, prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials from Representatives in Congress and from individuals representing the Governmental Relations Council for Exceptional Children; American Vocational Association; Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped; Great Oaks Joint Vocational District, Cincinnati, Ohio; Michigan state director of vocational education; Kentucky Department of Education; University of Nebraska; American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities; U.S. Department of Education; and Aleutian Region School District, Technical Center, Anchorage, Alaska. The text of H.R. 4793 is provided. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1983 Part II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED250475

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 4164 and H.R. 4793

TO CONSOLIDATE EXISTING FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, TO SIMPLIFY REQUIREMENTS FOR STATES AND OTHER RECIPIENTS PARTICIPATING IN FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN STATE AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL SKILLS IN THE WORK FORCE THAT WILL IMPROVE PRODUCTIVITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC,
ON FEBRUARY 7 AND 9, 1984

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

C-039926

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
35-667 O WASHINGTON : 1984

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
Ex Officio
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, DC, on:	
February 7, 1984	1
February 9, 1984	61
Text of H.R. 4793	98
Statement of:	
Bailey, Jack H., Grayson, KY	77
Ballard, Joseph, associate director, Governmental Relations Council for Exceptional Children	50
Bottoms, Gene, executive director, the American Vocational Association	7
Brody-Hasazi, Susan, chairperson, education committee, Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped	22
Kolde, Rosemary, Great Oaks Joint Vocational District, Cincinnati, OH	49
Loomis, Arnold, state director of vocational education, State of Michigan	48
McDonald, Alice, superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education	63
Meers, Gary, professor of education, University of Nebraska	53
Parnell, Dale, president, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges	20
Razeghi, Jane Ann, director, education and training, American Coalition of Citizens With Disabilities	30
Wise, Hon. Robert E., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia	1
Worthington, Dr. Robert, Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education	83
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Bailey, Jack H., Grayson, KY:	
Letter to the Congressional Subcommittee on Vocational Education regarding suggested improvements to Kentucky vocational education	77
Letter to U.S. Congressional Subcommittee on Education regarding possible improvements to our school system in Kentucky	76
Bottoms, Dr. Gene, executive director, American Vocational Association, prepared statement of, with attachments	13
Bower, Dick H., superintendent, Aleutian Region School District, Technical Center, Anchorage, AK, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 28, 1984	96
Brody-Hasazi, Susan, Ed.D., associate professor, Department of Special Education and Vocational Education, University of Vermont, and chairperson of the education committee, Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped:	
Letter to Congressman Murphy, dated February 6, 1984, from Consortium Concerned With the Developmentally Disabled	29
The Council for Exceptional Children, prepared statement presented by	25
McDonald, Alice, superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, prepared statement of	62
Parnell, Dale, president, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	21
Razeghi, Jane Ann, director of education and training for the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, prepared statement of	36
Sunia, Hon. Fofo I.F., a Delegate in Congress from the Territory of American Samoa, prepared statement of	96
Wise, Hon. Bob, a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia, prepared statement of	3

Page

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—Continued
Worthington, Robert M., Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education:
"A Study of Quick-Start Economic Development Programs," VII (Summary) 93
"Education for Tomorrow's Jobs" (Summary) 91
Prepared statement of 81

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1983

Part II

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1984

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 9:35 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Kildee, Williams, Hawkins, Boucher, Ackerman, Goodling, Packard, Gunderson, Bartlett, and Nielson.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, assistant general counsel and Nancy L. Kober, legislative specialist; and Richard DiEugenio, Republican senior legislative associate.

Mr. KILDEE [presiding]. The committee will come to order. Mr. Perkins will be here shortly but I will start off in his place.

This week, the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education plans to conclude hearings on H.R. 4164, the Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983.

Last year, we held four hearings on this bill, which is the result of extensive work by the American Vocational Association, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and the National Association for State Directors of Vocational Education.

These hearings have helped us to understand the major issues in vocational education reauthorization, and provided a forum for recommendations to improve the existing law or this bill.

The subcommittee has scheduled a markup session for this bill on February 22 at 9:30 a.m.

Our first witness this morning is our colleague, Hon. Robert E. Wise, Jr., a Member of Congress from the Third District of West Virginia.

Congressman Wise, you may give your testimony in toto or summarize it as you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. WISE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KILDEE. In any event, your whole testimony will be included in the record.

Mr. WISE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you. Vocational education is a program that I take personally, coming from West Virginia.

I feel compelled to say thank you for the more than 80,000 secondary school students, 44,000 adults, 12,000 community college

students, and an additional 31,000 part-time trainees, and 3,600 industry-trained West Virginians who receive vocational education.

These numbers alone reflect the importance that West Virginia places on industrial and technical training. It is very important to us, that I think you know, since our State, for the last year, has had the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, voc-ed is vital to preparing our work force for economic recovery.

This economic recovery does not come easy, however. Coal-producing counties in my district lie dormant. In some areas I have pockets of unemployment exceeding 30 and 40 percent. Of the 14 counties I represent, 7 have unemployment greater than 25 percent.

Heavy manufacturing has been battered by foreign competition attracting new firms to West Virginia, as is true with so many of our areas depends on the availability of a highly skilled pool of labor.

I just want to share—and I will depart from my statement pretty much—I just want to share some personal experiences with voc-ed and why I think it is so important what you are doing.

We had a Volkswagen plant open up several years ago. We did not have properly qualified people, and so to find the technical workers we had to recruit them not only from out of State but also from out of the country.

Voc-ed in that situation happily is being corrected because of vocational education.

This bill, I think, would do another thing, which is to provide very much needed equipment. When touring one voc-ed center in my district, I asked to see the area where they were receiving computer training, what was keeping us up in the new emerging fields of high technology. I was taken into a room where there were seven students working on keypunch machines.

We are playing at voc-ed if we are talking about keypunch machines in this day and age.

Happily, there has been an ARC grant that has gone to set up a statewide computer network. That will not reach all the voc-ed schools but will get to some of them. So we are improving that situation. I think this legislation would go a long way.

Let me say that we probably, in West Virginia, a prime laboratory for what is known as the industrial revolution or the technological revolution, are certainly going through a transition, and a very painful one—basic manufacturing State, heavily coal-mining State, lowest number of coal miners working in 100 years. So vocational education and the training it brings is really our main hope.

Finally, one estimate I have seen recently says that all jobs created within the next 5 years, 75 percent of them will not require a college degree but will require training beyond a high school degree. Well, that certainly applies to my State.

It is my belief and from what I am observing, most of us will probably have to be re-educated several times in our life. Vocational education is going to be the means by which we do that.

I just want to thank you for the opportunity to appear to present the West Virginia experience and West Virginia need, and to commend you and the deep commitment advanced by Chairman Perkins for this legislation. It is just vital to my State.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Congressman Robert E. Wise, Jr., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BOB WISE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, good morning.

Though I will be brief, I feel compelled to say "thank you" from the more than 80,000 secondary school students, 44,000 adults, 12,000 community college students, additional 31,000 part-time trainees and 3,600 industry-trained West Virginians who receive vocational education.

These numbers, alone, reflect the importance West Virginia places on industrial and technical training. Since our State has the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, voc-ed is vital to preparing our workforce for economic recovery.

That economic recovery will not come easy, however. The coal producing counties in my district lie dormant. The level of joblessness is some pockets exceeds 30 and 40 percent. Heavy manufacturing has been battered by foreign competition. Attracting new firms to West Virginia will depend on the availability of a highly-skilled pool of labor.

Our experience in West Virginia, though, has been troublesome. At the Volkswagen of American plant in my district for example, technical workers had to be recruited not only from outside the State, but from overseas, as well.

One voc-ed center I toured in my district was training its students on key-punch equipment. Mr. Chairman, if West Virginia is to make the slightest stride toward economic recovery in the 1980's and beyond, it is not going to do it on Stone-Age technology.

I compare this with voc-ed programs I visited last summer in North and South Carolina. They were modern facilities, reflecting the commitment of those States to the economic challenge of this generation.

In West Virginia, an A.R.C. grant has provided some vo-tech programs with computers. Reauthorizing the Vocational Education Act, I applaud Chairman Perkins for his proposal which would broaden the contribution this A.R.C. grant, for instance, has made to at least one part of West Virginia's voc-ed program.

Reauthorization of the V.E.A. should encourage business and industry to play a greater role in vocational education. For many laid-off coal miners in West Virginia, there is no hope of returning to the mines. Business can decide where there are opportunities for them. And where there are jobs, let's provide the education to perform them, and perform them well!

I hold the view that for most jobs you don't need a college eduction. But I also believe that you need more than a high school education. In this day and age when the dynamics of our economy are going through a revolution, vocational education can insulate a State such as West Virginia from the economic hardship we have had to endure over the past few years. The bold vision advanced by Chairman Perkins in his legislation points to that direction.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Wise. And thank you for the deep concern you have demonstrated in your tenure here in the Congress—a little shorter than mine but a very effective one—on vocational education.

Is there one suggestion you could make to the Congress, to the Federal Government, about how vocational education in West Virginia could be improved? For example, should we concentrate replacing equipment, on high technology, or other areas that might help in West Virginia?

Mr. WISE. I believe, Mr. Chairman—and probably I should be turning this over to those in voc-ed from my State—but in touring schools, for instance, in North and South Carolina this summer, as I did to try and get a picture of how some other States were doing it, and those States I have always heard about as being some of the leaders in the field.

One thing struck me, and that was how modern the equipment was. That the recognition being if we are serious about attracting

industry, then we have to have the most modern equipment for our people to learn on and, in turn, encourage industry to use that equipment.

In West Virginia, I think that is certainly the case. We have instances, for instance, of schools where the legislature has appropriated the money, the schools are built, but because of the financial crunch that every State has gone through, we are now able only to half-equip them.

So once again, to my mind, we have wasted the capital investment in the building if we are not able to put the proper equipment in it. Once again, only going halfway.

I think some States, for instance, might look at what has been done in other States, and that is having a pool of the most modern equipment but making that mobile. So that if you have a situation where you have a plant that is interested in locating in an area 30 miles, perhaps, from any voc-ed center you could sign a contract with that company, move that equipment out there, do the training that is necessary, and take it on to the next place.

Perhaps there might be some special provisions in this legislation to provide money for that, where you are setting up one basic set of equipment that could be mobile as opposed to trying to take 16 schools and give each one the same equipment.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Wise.

Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Wise, two questions from your testimony. First of all was the operation which you term "stone age operation," due primarily because of the lack of the educational community's will to change or were there other reasons? Sometimes this becomes a problem in education.

Mr. WISE. It does become a problem, Congressman Goodling.

My feeling is that it was due to a lack of resources, because the educators in that institution certainly knew that they weren't teaching as they should, and felt frustrated by it. But that was all the equipment they had.

As I say, subsequent to that, an Appalachian Regional Commission grant has been received by the State of West Virginia, permitting them to set up to purchase much more modern equipment for many of the schools. But I must say, sadly enough, this school that I visited did not receive that equipment and, therefore, presumably still operating at that same level.

Mr. GOODLING. My other question concerned the situation in eastern Kentucky as well as in my own State of Pennsylvania, in which it is a difficult getting men who were coal miners or steel miners—as is the case in Pennsylvania to retrain—both thinking that somehow or other they are going to go back to that job.

Are you faced with that same problem?

Mr. WISE. Yes, sir; particularly in the first year of the recession when the mines went down dramatically. And, of course, our mines—and I hope the situation is better in your—our mines, many of them, are still down. I think the recognition is really coming home that many of those mines aren't going to be opening up or if they do, they won't be working to that extent.

We do see many more miners now applying. Also, the TRA program has brought many in, particularly to receive training in automobile mechanics, house construction, and electrical wiring.

So we are seeing a pickup—at least my personal observation in visiting several schools—we are seeing a pickup in miners seeking employment.

Of course, you know, you have that problem of somebody who has been earning $12 to $15 an hour doesn't like the prospect, understandably, of going to school to learn a skill that is going to pay significantly less.

But I think that some facts of life are hitting home and people are seeking this training.

Mr. GOODLING. One last question. You mentioned TRA. In some areas the transition has been a good transition and in other areas CETA will continue on, with no kind of TRA transition at all.

How has the situation been in your area in relationship to all of the forces working together to try to make it a successful program?

Mr. WISE. In terms of TRA? As regards to everyone working together, it has been very good. In fact, the TRA officials—and we had some confusion over one set of people being, whether or not they would be deemed eligible. The TRA officials from Washington came in and sat down with the employment security people, with the union, and the company, so the working relationship has been good.

But my impression of TRA is it is like trying to sort out a plateful of spaghetti in terms of who is eligible for what. There are just some inherent conflicts in that law that make it almost impossible to make sense of. So the personnel have been helpful but that we have all been trying to figure out what the law will pay for and what it does.

Mr. GOODLING. All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Ackerman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. No questions.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Congressman, for your testimony.

Mr. WISE. Thank you for the chance.

Mr. KILDEE. I am sorry, Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. I would like to ask one question.

Two concerns I have with this bill have been raised. One is that it seems to open up an awful lot of extra categories and diversity of vocational education, broaden it, and make a lot of things eligible for participation.

Does this bother you at all or do you think that we should just stick with the current definition of vocational education?

Mr. WISE. Well, given the statement I have given and from whence I come, I would like to see it opened up as much as possible, because I think we need that in my particular setting.

Mr. NIELSON. I wasn't referring to the funding, I was referring to the number of categories that are eligible in this.

Mr. WISE. I know, I know what you are referring to.

Mr. NIELSON. That doesn't bother you?

Mr. WISE. No, sir.

Mr. NIELSON. OK, the second question.

In view of our financial situation, does the doubling of the vocational authorization concern you? Do you think that is money well spent, or do you think we should take a look at that figure?

Mr. WISE. I really regard that as the basic investment, particularly as we have cutout and apparently this Congress is not going to fund—that is a subject for another day—public-employment type programs, public-sector employment, the Government being the employer of last resort; you don't have a CETA program anymore; you don't have some of the major public employing programs.

If we are not going to have that—and that is not all bad, not having that—then I look at vocational education as being the replacement to that, and what you are doing is you are saying you are giving people a workable skill—we will provide that education.

But what you will do—for instance, in my State, and what I saw being done in the States that I visited, is that here you have a program that is tailored to business and to industry. It was told to me explicitly in South Carolina: We are not a board of regents, we are not higher ed, and we are not public ed. We are here to facilitate the growth of industry and business. And I think you will get back many times over what you put in voc-ed.

Mr. NIELSON. One last question.

Do you agree with the authors of the bill who suggest this should go through more than one agency in a State; it should go not just through the vocational education group, it should go through higher education as well? Do you agree with that philosophy?

Mr. WISE. I have got some problems with that. In fact, if I had my way in my State—and this is my personal observation, not that of anyone else in my State government—I would set vocational education as a separate program; not under the board of regents, not under the Department of Education, or secondary education, on the grounds that what we are seeing are great turf battles opening up.

What I have seen in other States is that is much the same. And once again referring to the North and South Carolina models, South Carolina never did put their vocational education department under either of the two traditional education systems. And the State of North Carolina just moved theirs out from the traditional educational agencies, recognizing that it is a separate kind of education altogether.

Mr. NIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. WISE. Thank you.

Mr. KILDEE. Congressman Boucher.

Mr. BOUCHER. Having just arrived, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions at this time.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

The next panel consists of Dr. Gene Bottoms, executive director of the American Vocational Association, who is a very good friend of this committee, accompanied by four other good friends: Dr. Dale Parnell, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; Arnold Loomis, who has been a mentor of mine in vocational education in the State of Michigan; Gary Meers, University of Nebraska; and Rosemary Kolde, Great Oaks Joint Vocational District, Cincinnati, OH.

I think there is room for the rest of the panel, there are two involved—to try to get some exchange between the panelists: Dr. Susan Brody-Hasazi, chairperson, education committee, Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped, accompanied by Joseph Ballard, associate director for governmental relations, Council for Exceptional Children; and Jane Razeghi, director of education and training, the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities.

If they could come up to the table now we will make room.

All right, Dr. Bottoms, if you would begin the testimony.

STATEMENT OF GENE BOTTOMS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BOTTOMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

I am Gene Bottoms, the executive director of the American Vocational Association. I would like to take just a moment to tell you a little bit about the four persons who will assist in answering questions you might have concerning H.R. 4164.

Dale Parnell is president of the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges. He is former State superintendent of schools in the State of Oregon and chancellor of a very large community college district in California.

Gary Meers is the president-elect of the AVA, professor of education at the University of Nebraska, where he has been heavily involved in programs for the handicapped, the disadvantaged, and the incarcerated.

Rosemary Kolde is a member of the AVA board, and is the director of the Great Oaks Area Vocational-Technical School in Cincinnati; and Arnold Loomis is the State director of vocational education in Michigan where he has given great leadership to that program.

Mr. Chairman, because of the time, we have not been able to complete our written testimony. I would like to ask that the record remain open until Friday until I can submit a written testimony.

Mr. KILDEE. The record will remain open for 5 days for submission of that testimony.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On November 1, the AVA and the AACJC and the State directors presented some comprehensive testimony on the development and the purpose and the provision of H.R. 4164.

Today, my comments will be limited to four priority emphasis in that bill and leave the remainder of time for discussion of issues that you might have.

First, we are concerned that whatever reauthorization bill emerge give a major national priority emphasis to the modernization, the improvement and expansion of the Nation's vo-tech capacity in light of current and projected workplace requirements.

There are three parts of the bill that give emphasis to this. Part A, the Basic State Grant; part D, the Industrial-Education Partnership for Training in High-Technology Occupations, and title II, the National Programs.

Under the modernization, improvement, and expansion priority, there were several items of emphasis we had in mind.

There is a greater need for technical level programs. This country has a shortage of engineering technicians.

Second, we have a real need to revise and update curriculum, staff, and instructional labs in a number of occupations that are being impacted by the changing technology in the workplace.

There is a great need to strengthen the academic foundation that underscores the practices of secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical programs so that graduates can not only get entry jobs but have the capacity to continue to learn.

And there is a need to expand programs in fields with growing employment opportunities and in communities with growing demands.

There is a need to prepare advance level technical and skilled workers through efforts that connect secondary and postsecondary programs with the workplace.

And there is a need to support both a national and State capacity for research and development.

We believe it is essential that the reauthorization of vocational education send a signal to State and local communities:

That it is essential to the Nation's economic and equity goals that the pursuit of excellence in vocational and technical education receive equal emphasis with academic education.

Mr. Chairman, we are concerned that the several reports on excellence have failed to give adequate attention to secondary vocational education in particular. We believe that this bill will serve as a base for strengthening emphasis on excellence both in secondary and postsecondary vocational education.

Second, we are concerned that the reauthorization legislation be structured so that adequate Federal investments can be appropriated to target populations of youth who have transitional problems moving from school to work, and adults who need special help to take full advantage of vocational education opportunities.

Part E of title II focuses on youth, particularly youth who are handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, that need vocational education to make this successful transition to full-time employment.

Part F of title II focuses on adults in need of vocational education in order to reenter, to advance or maintain employment.

Both parts make it possible for Congress to appropriate Federal dollars that must be spent on these target populations. A priority of both parts is to allow funds to be used for support services necessary for increasing enrollment and success of men and women in nontraditional programs.

The youth part gives emphasis to those youth that are handicapped, who are disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, single parents, and head of households and persons wishing to enter occupations considered nontraditional for their sex, and who need extra services and assistance to access and succeed in programs.

In designing the administrative provisions for the youth section, we sought to address some of the problems identified by the NIE study that was mandated by Congress concerning this part of the existing legislation.

The NIE study noted that the match provision of the current voc-ed legislation, places an incentive on enrolling disadvantaged and handicapped students into separate programs and not in the mainstream programs.

We have retained the match provision but we have reversed it. We propose to drop the match provision for students who are enrolled in mainstream programs and allow the Federal dollars to be used to pay the total cost for the extra services since State and local communities are already picking up the total cost of the regular programs. But where these students are placed in separate programs, the States would have to match that.

Now, we believe that more people will be served as the result of this; more will be served in mainstream programs that have a reputation with employers in the community; that State and local will in fact invest more because as more are served in the regular programs, the States are, in fact, investing more dollars on these special population youth in the regular programs and that separate programs will no longer be creative for administrative convenience because of the problems of meeting the excess cost requirements and the accounting paper work that is tied with existing legislation. For those of you who can be served in separate programs, then the local and State communities would match those.

NIE further pointed out the set-aside provisions have placed a cap on the amount of dollars that in fact can be appropriated for serving disadvantaged and handicapped youth.

While some members of the Appropriations Committee have often said to us, we would like to appropriate more dollars for the disadvantaged and handicapped, but we can't do that unless we raise the entire base.

I would like to just share with you the problem that we encountered.

With the set-aside in the current legislation, you take the 10 percent for the handicapped results in $123 being available for serving the handicapped in voc-ed. As contrasted under Public Law 142, Federal appropriations there for the handicapped and the general ed program amounts to $222. For the disadvantaged, the 20 percent set-aside for the disadvantaged comes to $56.14. For each disadvantaged student enrolled in voc-ed while under chapter 1, the Federal Government appropriates $610.

Now, our concern is we have been asked to do a job that we cannot do—the amount of dollars here are not adequate. These dollars do not flow with handicapped and disadvantaged students when they enroll in voc-ed. They are left with the general education program.

So we have got an awful lot of students—disadvantaged and handicapped—in the programs who lack basic skills, who need assessment, who need a lower teacher-student ratio, who need extra time, extra effort. While we have made vocational programs accessible and the growth rate has been very great over the last decade and disadvantaged and handicapped, what we have not been able to do is to deliver the quality of programs that increases their employability and their growth in the marketplace.

So what we tried to create by creating this title, this part E, we tried to establish—it was our intent to establish a floor by saying

that whatever the States spent in the last fiscal year on the existing legislation, they were required to spend under part 110–A, 110–B of the existing law, and 140, that regardless of the amount of dollars appropriated for part E, they would still have to spend that amount—and that is $211 million.

Now, under H.R. 4164, States would have to continue, regardless of the appropriation level, to spend $211 million.

We want a legislative structure that made it possible for this Congress and for the vocational educators and other interest groups to make a case to the Appropriations Committee to raise the appropriations here in line with the needs that exist to more effectively serve.

You cannot make that case with a set-aside. You can only make a case for raising the total amount. And we have been unsuccessful in doing that and the record stands for itself over the last 8 years in that regard.

So we attempted to try to structure a bill that would not only continue to access but drive additional dollars to get at that particular need.

Now, the third issue we tried to deal with was the issue of access cost. Now, the NIE study pointed out that an awful lot of rural systems and small systems were turning that money back because the access cost principle is tied to an accounting concept that creates a great deal of paperwork back to the individual student.

What we are about here is trying to look at what are those extra services above and beyond the regular program that these students need in order to benefit from vocational education.

Now, a number of those are outlined in part E: their assessment and intensive assessment, they represent the related instruction, many times a lower teacher-student ratio, and for many youth who enter voc-ed at the 10th or 11th grade and still can't read, write, and calculate after 10 years of basic education, you simply have to spend more time with them.

This is one group of youth that extend the school day and extend the school year for it to make sense. The only way they are going to progress in a job is if we give them the skills to continue to learn as well as a job entry skill.

So we shifted emphasis in H.R. 4164 from an excess cost principle to an extra service notion that the Federal dollars will pay for the extra services needed here for these individuals to succeed. And an effort to shift from an accounting strategy, to reduce the paperwork, so that more rural systems could participate, so that systems could begin to share services across lines.

The fourth item we dealt with is to try to focus on special populations of that group of youth who have transitional problems who represent one group and the other group being adults, who have different kinds of needs.

In addition, we made one other change that is important that you recognize from the existing bill. If you look at where the existing Federal dollars, many of those dollars go to operate the regular program, to maintain them.

If you look at H.R. 4164, we have removed using Federal dollars to maintain existing programs as a purpose. We do allow the use of Federal dollars to maintain these extra services for special popula-

tions. The only exception in there, there are a few States who continually said to us, if you pull out the Federal dollars tomorrow that we are using to operate some existing programs with that are needed, we can't find the State and local money overnight.

So we made it possible for the State board to make exceptions over a phaseout period.

The point I am trying to make: We made it possible for the Federal dollars to maintain services for these students but not the regular students, which is a substantial shift from the existing legislation to what has been proposed.

Now, with this background, there are many who feel that this is still not an acceptable approach to the handicapped and that maybe we ought to pull the handicapped out of part E and place it as a set-aside at the 10-percent level, or some percent level in part A.

There is certainly a precedent for that because the Federal statutes for the handicapped and for chapter 1 have in fact separated the disadvantaged and the handicapped in the treatment. The problem you still have, however, is a problem of how you drive up the dollars for an adequate amount.

Now, another alternative that you may want to consider as you work through this is a question that many people have raised: How do we get these Federal dollars already appropriated for handicapped youth and disadvantaged to follow those youth once they enter vocational education?

The point I want to leave with you—we feel what we proposed has merit; we gave a great deal of thought to it; we are flexible; we are concerned about this special population youth. And we want to work with you as you try to work through an acceptable means for getting at that.

Now, let me just return briefly to the adult priority. The cutbacks in Federal appropriations of the past 4 years have hurt us and often in programs for adults.

We recently surveyed some 600 local districts and community colleges, and 75 percent report that they have to restrict enrollments for adults; 50 percent are offering fewer night and afternoon classes; and 49 percent are offering fewer courses and programs for retrained adults. And many, many report waiting lists in those programs where there are job demands.

We will be proposing to you a technical amendment in the adult area to make sure that it says something to the effect that States shall address the particular needs of handicapped adults.

I have two other concerns, and I will be brief with those.

We were concerned, and the bill is before you, that there be a closer connection between vocational education in the private sector. I won't outline for you but the written testimony will have it for you, some 8 or 10 places in the administrative provisions that have linked closer with the private section.

We believe that what we proposed will involve the private sector, and employers, and designing, and implementing, and evaluating programs. In fact, one of the provisions call for teams of employers who employ people and fails to evaluate at least 20 percent of the programs each year that receive funding under this, particularly to see if those programs meet the requirements of the workplace.

We believe what we proposed is reasonable and cost effective.

The last point I would like to address is that there be an adequate level of Federal investment with this bill. We know that is an issue you are going to have to deal with.

Without some increased appropriations, H.R. 4164 simply represents words that have little meaning in the lives of people or increased worker productivity.

We believe that the authorization requested in H.R. 4164 amounting to $1.5 billion is reasonable. The enactment of this level of authorization would certainly send a message that the Members of Congress believe that vocational and technical education is important to achieve certain national economic goals and equity goals, and it should receive equal emphasis to academic education by State and local educational agencies.

It should be noted that the 1980 appropriation level for this field in today's dollars would exceed $1.1 billion.

The authorization level requested in H.R. 4164 is actually less than what was authorized in the existing legislation in 1976, some 8 years earlier—with inflation having gone now about 100 percent.

Finally, we recognize that the committee will have to decide on the authorization level. As to whether you are going to have an authorization level or go with such sums as necessary, our hope would be that for the initial authorizing year that you establish a level of authorization that would represent a significant increase over the present amount being appropriated, which would indicate that you recognize the level of need that exists, and further establish that this is an area needing greater national attention.

If that could be established, it would seem reasonable and appropriate to use the language such sums as necessary for the outyears.

Let me just share with you again some figures from the recent survey we have had in terms of how this year of education is hurting.

Sixty-seven percent of those who responded reported reduction in support services for students with special needs.

Seventy-two percent reported students having to pay more for the cost of voc-ed.

Seventy-nine percent report dollars have been reduced for curriculum development.

Ninety percent report that they have not been able to replace outdated equipment.

Eighty-one percent said they can't get current equipment repaired that is broken down.

Seventy-three percent reported that staff development activities have been reduced.

Seventy-two percent report reduction in leadership position at the local level, and 76 percent at the State level.

In summary, we sought to focus on a Federal role that would seek to modernize and improve while at the same time expanding access with quality for target groups to benefit from vocational education.

We seek to achieve this to procedures that strengthen the connections between voc-ed employers and labor, and the planning, conducting, and evaluating the national vo-tech program.

Dr. Parnell, at this point, wanted to make a brief statement on one of the concerns that we have addressed.

[Prepared statement of Gene Bottoms follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. GENE BOTTOMS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Gene Bottoms, Executive Director of the American Vocational Association. I have with me today four persons who will assist in answering any questions you might have.

Dale Parnell is the president of the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, former state superintendent of schools in Oregon and chancellor of a large community college district in California.

Gary Meers is the president-elect of the AVA and a professor of education at the University of Nebraska, where he has been involved in vocational education programs for the handicapped, the disadvantaged, and the incarcerated.

Rosemary Kolde, is a member of the AVA Board of Directors and is the director of the Great Oaks Area Vocational-Technical School in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Arnold Loomis, is the state director of vocational education in Michigan and is giving excellent state leadership for vocational education.

II. TESTIMONY OVERVIEW

Mr. Chairman, on November 1, the AVA, AACJC and state directors of vocational education presented comprehensive testimony on the development, purposes and provision of H.R. 4164. Today, my comments will be limited to four priority emphases in H.R. 4164, leaving the remainder of the time for discussion of those issues and concerns that you have.

First, we are concerned that H.R. 4164 retain as a major national priority the modernization, improvement and expansion of the nation's vocational-technical capacity in light of current and projected work place requirements. The three parts of the Bill that emphasize this priority are Part A (Basic State Grants); Part D (Industrial-Education Partnership for Training in High-Technology Occupation); and Title III (national programs).

Under the modernization, improvement and expansion priority, we have several areas in mind:

The need to give greater emphasis to technical level programs.

The need to revise, and update curriculum, staff, and instructional labs in light of changing requirements of the workplace.

The need to strengthen the "academic foundations" that underscore secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical programs so that vocational graduates not only have entry-level job skills, but also the capacity for continued learning that is necessary for advancement.

The need to expand programs in fields with growing employment opportunities and in communities that have increased demand for vocational education.

The need to connect a sequential secondary, postsecondary vocational education program with the work place in order to prepare advanced level technical and skilled workers.

The need to support both national and state research and development.

The need to improve programs that prepare people for work in the home.

We believe that the reauthorization of vocational education should send a signal to states and local communities, that the pursuit of excellence in vocational-technical education is essential to the nation's economic and equity goals, and that it receive equal attention with academic education.

We are concerned that the several reports on excellence have failed to give adequate attention to secondary vocational education, and we believe that H.R. 4164 will help strengthen secondary and postsecondary vocational education.

Our second concern is that H.R. 4164 be structured so that adequate federal investment can be appropriated to target populations of youth and adults who need special help to take full advantage of vocational education opportunities. Part E of Title II focuses on youth (handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English-speaking) that need vocational education to make a successful transition to initial full-time employment. Part F of Title II focuses on adults in need of vocational education in order to reenter, advance, and/or maintain employment. Both parts make it possible for Congress to appropriate federal dollars for these target populations, and to

allow funds for the support services necessary to increase the enrollment and success of men and women in nontraditional vocational programs.

Part E emphasizes handicapped, disadvantaged and limited English-speaking youth, single parents and heads of households, and persons wishing to enter occupations considered non-traditional for their sex. These are the students who need extra services and assistance to enter and succeed in vocational programs, and to eventually enter into employment.

In designing the administrative provisions for Part E, we sought to address some of the problems identified by the NIE study mandated by Congress on vocational education. The NIE study pointed out two particular problems with the set-asides for serving disadvantaged and handicapped youth.

First, the excess cost requirements impose record-keeping burdens that many locales find difficult to shoulder. Smaller and rural districts are especially hard pressed to account for excess costs and are therefore likely to be deterred from applying for federal funds to serve students with special needs.

Second, the interpretation of the excess cost requirements has created a disincentive to mainstream handicapped or disadvantaged students in regular classes. H.R. 4164 encourages the mainstreaming of handicapped students by decreasing the match requirement of the existing legislation, not eliminating it.

If local districts and vo-tech schools and community colleges enroll handicapped or disadvantaged students in mainstream vocational programs, H.R. 4164 proposes that federal funds be used to pay only the extra services required to effectively serve them. If they elect to enroll such students in separate programs, then the state and local eligible recipients would have to match the federal dollar. We believe the consequences of this shift in emphasis will mean that more handicapped and disadvantaged students will be served and that state and local systems will, in fact, invest more dollars in mainstreaming special population youth.

Under H.R. 4164, if states elect to establish special programs for handicapped students, they will no longer be able to secure 100 percent federal funding. They would, instead, have to match the federal contribution fifty-fifty, eliminating the financial and administrative advantage of establishing separate programs. It would thus be more attractive for states to use federal funds to pay the much lower extra costs of mainstreaming handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Though detailed figures are not available, we believe that the substantial portion of federal dollars is currently going for students in separate programs and a very small amount is going to the extra services required by mainstreamed students.

We believe this shift in emphasis constitutes an educational approach to the problem rather than the accounting approach that has created severe paper work and burdensome bookkeeping problems. Placing incentives on mainstreaming special population students would result in improved services to these youth and ensure their access to the programs that have better reputations with employers. The extra services approach would, in fact, allow some systems—too small to do anything on their own—to pool their resources and mount a core of common services that would benefit both handicapped and disadvantaged populations.

The set-aside provision of the existing vocational education legislation has limited the funds for the handicapped, disadvantaged, and other populations to 10 and 20 percent of the basic state grant respectively. Increasing these amounts, therefore, requires increasing the appropriations for the total grant—often a monumental task.

As a result, the set-aside approach has not resulted in driving up appropriations that can respond to the increasing need. It has greatly expanded access, but the field cannot deliver to handicapped and disadvantaged people the quality of services they need to be effectively prepared for employment.

Our intent with H.R. 4164 was to create a legislative structure that would enable Congress more easily to appropriate dollars to match the needs of target populations.

But this is not all. Vocational education has been asked to provide a costly and important service to handicapped and disadvantaged people, but has been given less federal support than other programs for underserved populations. The federal allocation under the Vocational Education Act amounts to $123.12 per handicapped pupil in 1980–81 compared with $229.29 per pupil under The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The disparity is even greater for disadvantaged youth—$56.14 per pupil in 1980–81 under the Voc-Ed Act, compared with $610.84 per pupil under Chapter I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1981–82.

In addition, dollars appropriated to disadvantaged and handicapped students under other federal programs do not follow those students into vocational education.

Vocational education, therefore, must rely on the established set-asides alone, even if they are not enough to cover increasing needs.

Several groups have expressed concern that proposing a youth section with its own line item authorization would eliminate federal support for the handicapped and disadvantaged. They believe that only Part A of Title II would receive appropriations.

We sought to address this concern by drafting an administrative procedure on Page 76, starting with line 21. This states that regardless of the appropriation level for Part E, states would be required to spend at least the same level of federal dollars that they were required to spend in the last fiscal year under Section 110 a and b, and Section 140 of the existing legislation. Based on 1984 appropriations, this would be $211,579,340.

To give even greater emphasis to using federal dollars as a priority for target populations, page 74, lines 1-10 of H.R. 4164 restrict the use of federal dollars to pay the basic operating cost of existing programs to target population youth and adults.

Other exceptions would require special action of the State Board of vocational education. This provision was placed there to allow a few states time to shift the operation cost of certain programs to state and local sources. It should be noted that the emphasis in Part A of Title II is to use federal funds to improve, to intensify and to modernize existing programs.

H.R. 4164 does, in fact, target federal dollars on program modernization, improvement, new programs, and the targeted population of youth and adults. It also seeks to limit the use of federal dollars to pay the basic programs cost. The recent cutback in federal appropriations for vocational education, however, has resulted in a reduction of vocational education services to adults.

Over 75% of eligible recipients report enrollment restrictions, over 50% are offering fewer night and late afternoon courses, while 49% are offering fewer special courses and programs for retraining adult workers. With the kind of economic transition this nation is currently in, it is essential that the nation's vocational and technical capacity be extended to serve the greater number of adults in need of training, retraining and upgrading.

Our third concern is that there be a closer connection between vocational education and the private sector in the general provisions of H.R. 4164. Following are some of the provisions:

a. A majority of the state advisory council members shall represent the private sector, including the chairperson.

b. The role of the Council should expand to include: advising the State Board on the development of state plans; making reports to the Governor and others concerning policies the state should pursue to strengthen vocational education; recommending initiatives and methods the private sector could undertake to assist in the modernization of vocational education programs.

c. Page 69, line 18, of H.R. 4164 requires the state plan to ensure that vocational education programs receiving federal funds be designed and implemented with the assistance of employers. The plan should also address the demands of the job market, and reflect changes in the content of jobs.

d. A partnership approach is sought in the development and funding programs for high-technology occupations with the private sector as set forth in Part D.

e. On Page 77, Section 4.13, a local advisory council is mandated. Its functions are described and the majority of its membership, including the chairperson, must be from the private sector.

f. Section 4.42 requires that states each year evaluate at least 20 percent of the eligible recipients of federal funds, and that this evaluation be done by teams of individuals who are engaged in the type of work for which students are being prepared. The legislation is quite specific about the focus of the evaluation. It shall include planning and content of the program; the curriculum; qualifications of teachers; counselors; equipment; instructional materials; and the effect of the program on the subsequent work experience of the graduate.

We believe effective vocational education depends on involvement and a close working relationship with the private sector and employers; and that these provisions are reasonable and will be cost effective.

Our fourth concern has to do with the level of federal investment. Without increased appropriations, H.R. 4164 simply represents words that won't have meaning in the lives of individuals, and will not increase worker productivity:

a. We believe that the total authorization requested in H.R. 4164, amounting to approximately 1 billion, 500 million dollars, is reasonable. By enacting this level of authorization, members of Congress would send the message that vocational-technical education is important to the achievement of certain national goals and should

receive equal emphasis to academic education by state and local educational agencies.

b. It should be noted that the 1980 appropriation level in today's dollars would exceed 1 billion, 100 million dollars as contrasted with the actual appropriation level in 1984 of 742 million.

c. The authorization level requested in H.R. 4164 is actually less than that authorized in the previous legislation.

d. However, we recognize that the Committee itself will have to eventually decide on the level of authorization. Our hope is that, for the initial authorizing year, the committee would establish a level of authorization that would represent a significant increase over the present amount being appropriated. This would indicate that the committee recognizes the level of need that exists and further establish that this is an area needing greater national attention. If that could be established, it would seem reasonable and appropriate to use the language "such sums as necessary for the outyears".

To support this request let me share what is happening across the country in vocational education as reported by secondary and postsecondary institutions and state leaders:

67% report a reduction in support services for students with special needs.

72% report that students have to pay more for the cost for vocational education.

79% report that dollars have been reduced for curriculum development.

90% report they have not been able to replace outdated equipment and 81% report funds are not available for equipment repair.

78% report that they have not been able to develop new programs in an area of need.

73% report that staff development activities have been reduced.

72% report reduction in leadership positions at the local level while 76% report reduction in state staff.

III. SUMMARY

In summary, we have sought a focus on a federal role that would seek to modernize and improve the nation's vocational-technical capacity, while at the same time, expanding access for providing those extra services essential for target groups to benefit from vocational education.

We sought to achieve this through procedures that would strengthen the connection between vocational education, employers and laborers in planning, conducting and evaluating the nation's voc-tech programs.

It was our intent to make sure that we have quality programs in vocational education from which special population groups could benefit. We have proposed a legislative structure that would make it possible for federal appropriations to increase according to the needs of target populations and make special target populations a greater priority than they are in the existing legislation. Appendix A contains suggested technical amendments to further clarify our intent that H.R. 4164 serve special population youth. We believe that we have guaranteed at least the current level of support with potential for substantial increases.

However, this committee has several options concerning targeted population youth. The approach used to address the handicapped youth in H.R. 4164 is still an area of concern to some groups. It is argued that the handicapped would find themselves having to compete with the disadvantaged, the limited English-speaking, and women. It has been suggested that this concern could be addressed by removing the handicapped provision completely from Part E and placing it under Part A with a possible 10% set-aside—and there is precedent for this separation.

Another approach that would ensure that vocational education received adequate funds to provide quality services to special populations would be to amend 941-42 and Chapter 1, so that dollars appropriated for disadvantaged and handicapped students would in fact follow those students when they enroll in vocational education.

We believe that the approach proposed in H.R. 4164 has merit. However, the ultimate decision on how to better support and serve special population youth through vocational education resides with you. Thank you.

APPENDIX A

AMENDMENT H.R. 4164

Page 33—line 4

After the word "States" delete the remainder of the sentence and substitute the following phrase—or . . . "to find those extra services, programs and activities nec-

essary to enable eligible youth to participate in vocational education and which are authorized by this part.

Page 32—line 8

Insert after the word twenth-one: (except where state law determines the age of handicapped youth eligible for services under this act to be other than twenty-one, the state law shall prevail).

Page 35—line 18

Add a new subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) Funds allocated to eligible recipients under this part shall be used only to provide the cost of extra services for eligible youth to enable them to enter and succeed in vocational education programs.

Page 37—line 16

Add a new paragraph (b) and renumber paragraph (b) to become the new paragraph (c).

The new paragraph (b) to be read as follows:

(b) States shall, in accordance with the state plan called for in Section 411, designate funds under this part to provide the extra services needed by handicapped, disadvantaged and limited English-proficient students in order to enter and succeed in vocational education programs.

Page 38—line 16

Add new subparagraph (VI) to read as follows:

(VI) disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English-proficient adults;

Page 46—line 1

After the phrase "(including vocational education" insert the phrase—"and individuals who have knowledge and qualifications with respect to the needs of minorities, handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English-proficient students and women".

Page 61—line 1

After the word "individual" and before the word "to", insert the following: . . . "whose sole duties shall be". . . .

Page 76—line 21 through Page 77—line 2

Delete paragraph 13 in its entirety and substitute a new paragraph 13 to read as follows:

13. That for each fiscal year, expenditures in the state for vocational education programs, services and activities for the handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English-proficient and other special needs youth requiring additional services to succeed in vocational education from parts A and E of Title II shall not be less for the handicapped than that expended from the 10% allocation for the handicapped under section 110(a) of PL 94-482 and shall not be less than that expended for the disadvantaged from the 20% allocation for the disadvantaged under section 110(b) and section 140 of PL 94-482 for the last fiscal year funded by the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Page 77 after line 2

Add a new paragraph to become paragraph 14.

14. That at least 30% of a state's allocation that is in excess of the total allocated for the last fiscal year funded by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 shall be expended for those extra services, programs and activities authorized by Part E of Title II of this Act.

Page 105—Add a new line 17—Add a new term

(26) The term "Limited English Proficiency" means an individual—

1. (i) Who was not born in the United States or whose native language is other than English;

(ii) Who comes from a home in which a language other than English is most relied upon for communication; or

(iii) Who is an American Indian or Alaskan Native student and comes from an environment in which a language other than English has had a significant impact on his or her level of English proficiency.

2. Who, as a result of the circumstances described in paragraph (1) of the definition of "Limited English Proficiency" of this section, has sufficient difficulty in understanding, speaking, reading or writing the English language to deny him or her the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English (20 U.S.C. 3223(a)(1)).

QUESTIONS

1. Where does the AVA stand on the establishment of performance standards?

First, H.R. 4164 provides for establishing performance goals at state and local levels through the planning process and provides a means of evaluating the results. These performance goals address both program goals and student outcome goals.

Second, performance goals in H.R. 4164 address lab or market demands and competencies required for entry-level jobs. Further performance goals address technological literacy and the academic foundation level expected of vocational graduates that is necessary for further learning and the accessibility of target populations to vocational education programs.

Third, the emphasis on performance goals is followed through in the local planning process and are evaluated in the state and local evaluation that is called for in H.R. 4164.

DETAILED PROVISIONS FOR PERFORMANCE GOALS IN H.R. 4164

Step 1: Starting with line 3. The state is required to develop a three-year plan and to thoroughly assess the current and projected demands for general and specific occupational skills within the state and the needs of individuals serviced or that proposes to serve.

Step 2: Page 69, starting with line 18. The state is to set forth goals to be achieved during the three-year period of the plan concerning:

a. design and implementation of programs with the assistance of employers;
b. programs that address the demand of the job market; and,
c. teaching of competencies that reflect the content of existing jobs.

Second, they are to set goals designed to increase the technological literacy of students and improve their academic foundations in math and science as set forth on Page 70, lines 7 through 11.

Third, on Page 70, lines 19–21, they are to set forth goals concerning the accessibility of women, the disadvantaged, handicapped, and individuals of limited English proficiency.

Step 3: Page 71. The states are to describe the progress they expect to make toward achievement of these goals during the three-year period of the state plan. It is our intent that they describe programs that are measurable.

Step 4: Page 71, lines 12–18. The state is to describe the methods and strategies that it will employ to reach the goals set forth pursuant to the above.

Step 5: Page 77, lines 8–23. Under the local planning provision set forth on page 77u, eligible recipients are to access local needs in light of state goals and are to set forth specific goals they propose to achieve over the three-year period.

Step 6: Page 80. The state is to describe and present evidence showing the progress made under the state plan toward achieving the goals previously established and to report this in their progress report.

Step 7: The state is to convene a team of persons that includes individuals engaged in the type of work for which students are being prepared. The team will evaluate annually at least 20% of the programs receiving assistance under this Act. This is to determine whether the programs reflect the requirements of the work place.

Step 8: Page 82. The state is charged to gather and analyze data to determine the extent to which the vocational programs are achieving the goals and the progress expected. This will require states to use standardized testing instruments and in some cases to develop other performance measures. The purpose of the assessment is to allow the state to determine which strategies are working and to alter those strategies in order to facilitate progress towards stated goals.

2. Where does the AVA stand in regard to having technical committees composed of employers and labor representatives responsible for identifying competencies needed for each occupational area?

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools has done a great deal of research in developing competencies needed in occupational areas. There are 12 active states working with the Association on VTECS. These states include, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia and Missouri. They have had a total of 20 states over the past 20 years, and the U.S. Air Force, Army, Marines and Navy are associate members. They have approximately 130 occupations for which they have identified competencies, and 20 of these have gone through revision. In addition, they have 300 independent job titles. Currently, they are working on 12 curriculum guides and are doing research on the Test Item Bank. Their Board voted to make this part of VTECS.

The AVA would be supportive of state level technical committees (composed of employers and labor representatives) to identify competencies needed for different

occupational areas. We are concerned with the cost of this and believe that at least 50% of the cost should be borne by the private sector.

Each year, some limitations would have to be placed on the number of technical committees established. For example, in states that offer preparation in 300 or more occupational areas, the task of staffing, convening, and follow-through is extremely costly and almost overwhelming.

3. Why do we prefer the wording "sole state board of vocational education" as opposed to "sole state agency"?

With a sole state board whose members are appointed by the governor, representation from business, industry, labor and the general public can be assured. A sole state agency would not have this representation.

A few states, such as Montana, do not have state boards. In such cases, the head of the department of instruction becomes the board. Having one person in charge of the entire vocational system is not the way to govern it.

4. What are the provisions of H.R. 4164 for women?

Assisting women to enter and pursue non-traditional occupations is a goal woven throughout H.R. 4164. The administrative provision concerning women requires that a state sex equity coordinator be present on the state council. It also requires a goal to be addressed in the state plan; an area where federal dollars can be used to maintain services; incentives that are given for serving women in mainstream non-traditional programs. Each local plan has to address the issue of sex equity, and the state has to evaluate its progress.

5. What are the detailed provisions in H.R. 4164 for women?

a. Page 4, line 18. The purpose is to assist women in taking full advantage of vocational education programs and opportunities.

b. Page 20, line 8. The child care option is retained.

c. Part C. Comprehensive career guidance and counseling; elimination of sex bias and stereotyping.

d. Part D. Training for high-technology occupations; and making these programs accesible to women.

e. Part E. Vocational education programs for youth with special needs; to provide opportunities for women who need special assistance to enter and succeed in non-traditional occupations.

f. Part F. Adult training, retraining, and employment development; making programs accessible to women.

g. Title IV. General Administrative provision provides for full time state sex equity coordinator.

h. State is required to have appropriate representation for women on state council.

i. State is required to have state goals and strategies in state plans for making non-traditional vocational education programs accessible to women.

j. Page 74, line 4. Under state application, the state can use federal funds to maintain programs to meet the special needs of women.

k. Page 74, line 8. States are given an incentive to involve women in mainstream non-traditional programs (page 74).

l. Page 77. Local eligible recipients are required to describe how their goals relate to achieving access for women to non-traditional programs.

m. Requires the state to assess the effectiveness of state strategies for addressing women and to alter strategy as needed.

5. How has AVA sought to address the access of women to non-traditional programs?

Rather than focus on target populations separately, we have focused on youth having difficulties moving from school to work, and adults who need training, retraining and extra services for reemployment or advancement, or employment in non-traditional areas. Included in both these groups are the handicapped, the disadvantaged, limited English-proficient students, the unemployed, out-of-school youth and women entering non-traditional roles.

6. How does H.R. 4164 connect vocational education and JTPA?

Summary

A. Coordination and consultation required for Part E and F.
B. Compatibility of data and information system.
C. Linkage of national and state council through membership.
D. Expanded evaluationrole of state and national council to look at both systems.
E. Coordination to be described through state planning.

7. How does H.R. 4164 connect vocational education and JTPA?

Detail listing

A. Page 35, Section 243. Requires states to include methods and procedures for encouraging programs for youth to be coordinated with programs for adults under Title II—JTPA.

B. Page 41, Section 253. Requires states to coordinate and consult with State Job Training Council and to adopt procedures to encourage eligible recipients and PICs to work together to achieve most effective use of all federal funds.

C. Title III, Page 42. Requires cooperation between secretaries of education and labor to make the vocational education data system compatible with the occupational information data of JTPA.

D. Page 45. Requires a person from National Commission for Employment Policy of JTPA to be on National Council for Voc-Ed. Page 64—same is required of State Council.

E. Page 47. Charge the national council to advise the Congress with respect to improvement of this Act and JTPA. A similar responsibility is given to state councils on Page 66.

F. Page 72. State plan to describe methods of coordination.

G. Page 78. State may encourage regional planning.

H. Page 80. Requires sharing of state plan with state job training and coordinating council.

Chairman PERKINS [presiding]. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF DALE PARNELL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Mr. PARNELL. I would like to talk about money and cut through all the rest of this because we do appreciate this opportunity to express again the support of community technical and junior colleges for the new Vocational Technical Education Act, H.R. 4164, the bill that you are developing.

But I want to underscore the importance of the $1.5 billion support level, which is the target.

A close look at the funding pattern on vocational education over the past 10 years shows that vocational education and particularly postsecondary vocational education is gradually being starved to death at the Federal level.

This point is made graphically by looking at the $784 million appropriated in 1980 as opposed to the $738 million, some $46 million less fewer actual dollars in 1984. Paradoxically, the shrinking Federal support flies in the face of the growing national concern over training and keeping Americans working.

Clearly, the Nation wants to see skill training expanded and upgraded to combat unemployment; upward mobility, to increase productivity, to keep the work force abreast of accelerating technology and our global economic competition.

H.R. 4164's provision of $1.5 billion is both realistic and necessary, as a countercyclical kind of investment in this country if the changing focus and the new dimensions of the act are to produce the desired results.

Our figures indicate that the existing programs would have to be funded at nearly a $1.2 or $1.3 billion level just to keep up with the purchasing power of 1975 when $625 million were appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4164 takes some very important steps to make vocational education more responsive to the changing needs and changing situations of this country, particularly in meeting the sharply expanded needs for serving adults. But these needs will not be met without the supporting resources. If the resources are the

same and you proceed with H.R. 4164 to just simply reshuffle the dollars, then all you have done is created a gigantic turf battle.

I am here today to just tell you that we really need the resources in order to implement H.R. 4164 to make H.R. 4164 the kind of bill that you would like to see. If these needs and expectations are to be realistically served, the level of support that Congress provides for the reauthorization will be the vital factor.

[Prepared statement of Dale Parnell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DALE PARNELL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate this opportunity to express again the community colleges' support for the Vocational Technical Education Act that you and this Committee are developing, and to underscore the importance of the $1.5 billion support level at which H.R. 4164 aims.

A close look at the funding pattern on VEA over the last 10 years shows that the program is gradually being starved to death at the federal level. This point is made graphically in the accompanying chart.

Only once in the 10 years since FY1975 has the funding for VEA come close to staying level in purchasing power. As the chart shows, even in that one year—FY1980—the purchasing power that one might have expected from a funding boost of $100 million was more than offset by a jump of nearly 30 points in the Consumer Price Index the same year.

Paradoxically, Mr. Chairman, the shrinking federal support flies in the face of the growing national concern over training. Clearly, the Nation wants to see skill training expanded and upgraded to combat unemployment, to increase productivity, and to keep the workforce abreast of accelerating technology and global economic competition.

H.R 4164's provision of $1.5 billion is both realistic and necessary, if the changing focus and the new dimensions of the Act are to produce the desired results.

As the chart shows, the existing programs would have to be funded at nearly $1.2 billion if they were to have the same purchasing power they had in FY1975 with a $625 million appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4164 takes some very important steps to keep and make vocational education more responsive to the Nation's changing needs and expectations, particularly in meeting the sharply expanded postsecondary and adult demand for training and retraining. But, these needs will not be met without the supporting resources.

If those needs and expectations are to be realistically served, the level of support that Congress provides for the reauthorization will be a vital factor.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS 1975–85

Fiscal year	(Million)	CPI (1967=100)	Dollars if 1975 funding level followed CPI	Purchasing power/ appropriations (−+)
1975	625.9	161.2	625.9	0
1976	565.1	170.5	662.0	(96.9)
1977	619.0	181.5	704.7	(85.7)
1978	642.1	195.4	758.7	(116.6)
1979	681.6	217.4	844.1	(162.5)
1980	784.0	246.8	958.3	(174.3)
1981	681.6	272.4	1,057.6	(376.0)
1982	655.8	289.1	1,122.5	(466.7)
1983	728.7	298.4	1,158.6	(429.9)
1984	738.5	[2] 303.5	1,178.4	(439.9)
1985	[1] 738.5	.....	1,178.4	(439.9)
Ten year totals	7,460.8	.....	10,249.2	(2,788.4)

[1] President's FY85 Budget Request.
[2] Closing CPI of 1983.

Chairman PERKINS. Let's hear from Dr. Susan Brody-Hasazi at this time. Go ahead, you start your testimony. Speak loudly so everybody can hear.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN BRODY-HASAZI, CHAIRPERSON, EDUCATION COMMITTEE, VERMONT COALITION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. Thank you very much.

I am Susan Brody-Hasazi from the University of Vermont. I am a professor of special education and vocational education, and I am also chair of the Education Committee for the Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped.

I have with me today Joseph Ballard, who is the assistant director of governmental relations for the Council for Exceptional Children.

We thank the chairman and distinguished Members of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education for the opportunity to testify regarding the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act and, more specifically, how H.R. 4164 can be made to work effectively on behalf of handicapped youth.

The Council for Exceptional Children, representing some 50,000 professionals in the field of special education, is committed to the advancement of vocational education for exceptional persons.

It is our primary purpose today to offer recommendations to further that advancement.

Mr. Chairman, we have offered testimony twice in the last 2 years to this panel, testimony in which we discussed in some detail the strengths and weaknesses of the current statutes in vocational education and in which we offered our proposals for strengthening the statutes with respect to the full and appropriate participation of handicapped youth during the course of any future reauthorization.

Since we are rapidly moving toward the time of decisionmaking by this committee, we will limit ourselves to a brief statement of the issues now specifically at hand and would respectfully offer to you our previous statements for more comprehensive comment and background.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4164 in its present form excludes the 10 percent set-aside as currently in statute.

The first part of the alternative offered is a "hold harmless" at whatever level of appropriations exists in the last fiscal year under the terms of the existing statute.

But a hold harmless is nothing more than a permanently frozen allocation level, rather than the critical motivation contained in a set-aside, namely, that those who fight for handicapped youth will realize proportionate gains if they work to increase the appropriations under the basic State Grant Program.

In other words, a hold harmless is very unwise politics for everyone concerned about the basic program in vocational education.

The second part of the alternative offered in H.R. 4164 is the inclusion of handicapped youth in a new part E along with other special populations.

Let us simply say that the reaction from our colleagues around the Nation to this proposal can only be characterized as truly resounding opposition.

Our opposition occurs for at least four reasons:

The inclusion of the set-aside in the basic State-local grant program, which has been and surely will remain the primary focus of Federal appropriations and the main resource for direct program support and development, announced to the Nation that meeting the vocational needs of handicapped youth was a top priority in the Federal role in vocational education. Inclusion in the proposed part E clearly says to us that such a status would cease.

Inclusion in the basic State-local program also clearly announced that the handicapped youth were to be brought into the mainstream of regular vocational education.

And, in point of fact, the States are now reporting that 74.7 percent of handicapped youth are being served in mainstream vocational education programs, unlike the percentage that was reported earlier that Mr. Bottoms spoke of, which was prior to these amendments—practically 75 percent of handicapped students were being served in separate programs.

This is a dramatic reversal of reports in the early seventies.

Why do potential damage to this potential momentum? Or, to borrow the old adage: "If it isn't broke, why do we want to fix it?"

The structure of the proposed part E in H.R. 4164 is disturbingly reminiscent of the block grant proposals of 1981 and 1982, which members of this committee will well remember.

Our analysis shows that part E could pit populations of children and their parents against each other in their struggle for a portion of the part E allocation at the State and local levels.

CEC would not want this situation to obtain for any of the populations proposed for inclusion, whether handicapped, women, of limited English-proficiency, or economically disadvantaged.

We oppose this block grant proposal as vigorously as we opposed the block grant proposals respecting handicapped and economically disadvantaged in 1981.

H.R. 4164 proposes a startup authorization of $325 million for part E, increasing to $500 million. This is indeed a large amount, but is it realizable?

CEC has always worked, and will continue to work, diligently for needed increases in Federal appropriations. But at a time when very committed proponents of the proposed mathematics and science education legislation are wondering whether the startup appropriations of some $400 million for that bill is realizable, what are we realistically to expect in actual appropriations for part E, which will surely be seen as a secondary and support program in vocational education?

Mr. Chairman, we reiterate our support for the set-aside within the basic State and local grant program and reaffirm our position that the proposed alternatives in H.R. 4164 are dangerously regressive.

We also endorse continuation of both the matching and excess cost requirements as current mechanisms working with the set-aside. Why? We are beginning to see in the basic data that the set-aside—especially when this committee added the matching and

excess cost factors in the 1976 legislation—is at last causing concrete progress for handicapped youth.

In terms of the total number of handicapped youth enrolled in vocational education, in 1975–76, it was roughly 284,000. In 1980–81, it was roughly 555,000.

In terms of the percentage of handicapped students is the total enrollment in vocational education, it went from 1.8 percent in 1975–76 to school year 1980–81 to 3.3 percent of the total enrollment.

The State and local allocations further, in 1976–77 went from $76 million to currently 1980–81 to roughly $156 million.

In addition, the Council for Exceptional Children, along with other major national organizations concerned with the well-being of handicapped youth, are requesting an increase in the current set-aside from 10 to 15 percent.

While placing stress on the progress which is at last occurring in enrollment of handicapped youth, we must also touch upon the down side of the available evidence.

Again using the latest available figures, school year 1980–81, handicapped children and youth in special education now represent 9.5 percent of the total school age population in the Nation.

However, handicapped youth still represent only 3.3 percent of the total enrolled population in vocational education. Moreover, precisely the same percentages in enrollments are reflected in grades 9 through 12 in 1980–81.

The National Center for Education Statistics reports a total enrollment in grades 9 through 12 of roughly 13 million, with handicapped students comprising an estimated 9.5 percent of this group, totaling roughly 1,200,000.

Vocational education served roughly 400,000 of the total number of handicapped students in grades 9 through 12, or 34.6 percent.

It is generally acknowledged professionally that this percentage is far too low, and must be remedied. Moreover, for a significant number of handicapped youth, unlike the nonhandicapped, vocational education is one of the very few viable options in preparation for an occupation.

To put it another way, vocational education may be one of a number of valuable options for a nonhandicapped youth, but may be the critically needed option for handicapped youth.

We feel that such an increase is not only justified by the low enrollment numbers, but also by the urgent need to enhance the participation of handicapped youth across the full spectrum of vocational education program options, as well as to enhance the participation of handicapped youth in programs of true quality in the least restrictive environment.

It has become clear that further fiscal support for general program development along with continued fiscal support for direct program purposes are required. Therefore, we support the approach to an additional 5 percent being offered by Representative Austin Murphy, your colleague on the Education and Labor Committee and chairman of the Select Education Committee.

Mr. Murphy's proposal would allow the States and local recipients the option of using the additional 5 percent for both direct

service and for other activities related to the vocational education of handicapped youth.

In summary, since 1976, there have been dramatic increases in the total State and local dollars available for handicapped students in vocational education. From 1976 to 1977, when the local contributions were roughly $76 million to 1980–81 when those contributions rose to roughly $156 million, representing a dollar-for-dollar match in 1976–77 to roughly a $2 and $50 non-Federal match to the dollar Federal share.

Also, in terms of the increases in the numbers of handicapped students in vocational education, from 1975–76 to 1980–81, there has been a 95 percent increase in the participation of handicapped students in vocational education.

The excess cost requirement has also been extremely helpful. The practice that Dr. Bottoms spoke of in his testimony where almost the entire population of handicapped students in voc-ed were previouusly served in separate programs has practically been reversed.

In the report to Congress by the Secretary this past year, it was identified that 75 percent of handicapped students in vocational education are currently participation in mainstream programs.

We also believe that because this particular statute has done such a good job in increasing access for handicapped students in vocational education that we need to increase it to perhaps a 15-percent set-aside in order to provide for full participation of all handicapped students in a variety of programs. And also to ensure that the more moderately and severely handicapped students which have not been participating in vocational education to the degree that we would hope, would be able to.

In addition, I am here today with some of this information because of the vocational education data system and the information that it has provided us relative to participation of handicapped and disadvantaged individuals in voc-ed.

We would like to ensure that this information would be available for Congress in order to make future decisions.

Last, we are in full support of the amendments that Congressman Murphy has transmitted to you because we believe that those amendments would provide greater access to handicapped individuals in vocational education.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. We appreciate your long-term commitment to including handicapped individuals in the mainstream of society. And we think that the approach that Congress has taken in the past has been helpful and has been successful, and we would like to see that expanded to include even greater numbers of handicapped individuals.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Susan Brody-Hasazi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, PRESENTED BY SUSAN BRODY-HASAZI, ED.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT AND CHAIRPERSON OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, VERMONT COALITION OF THE HANDICAPPED

We thank the Chairman and the distinguished members of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education for the opportunity to testify regarding the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act and, more specifi-

cally, how H.R. 4164 can be made to work effectively on behalf of handicapped youth. The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), representing some 50,000 professionals in the field of special education, is committed to the advancement of vocational education for exceptional persons. It is our primary purpose today to offer recommendations to further that advancement. But let us first present a very brief legislative background from the standpoint of our perspective on behalf of exceptional persons.

BACKGROUND

The federal role in vocational education in public schools began with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. This Act allocated funds to states to encourage high schools to provide more practical occupational training.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the subsequent 1968 Amendments made major changes in federal vocational education policy. The 1963 Act targeted aid toward particular disadvantaged groups. The 1968 Amendments specified that at least 15 percent of each state's basic grant be used for disadvantaged students, at least 10 percent for handicapped students, and at least 10 percent for post-secondary and adult education. Our recollection is that you, Mr. Chairman, were a strong supporter of inclusion of the set-aside for the handicapped. We remain grateful for that support.

P.L. 94-482, the Education Amendments of 1976, made no changes in the basic goals and purposes of the Vocational Education Act. However, it increased the set-aside for the disadvantaged to 20 percent and to 15 percent for postsecondary and adult education. It retained the 10 percent set-aside for the handicapped and increased pressure on state and local agencies to serve handicapped individuals in vocational education programs. P.L. 94-482 requires that federal dollars spent under the handicapped set-aside be matched with state and local dollars to pay for the excess costs of services for handicapped students.

Furthermore, Section 107 of P.L. 94-482, requires State Plans which (1) described programs and services for the handicapped; (2) describe how these programs and services are to be coordinated in conformity with the handicapped student's "individualized educational program" as required by P.L. 94-142; and (3) describe how all of the preceding are consistent with the State Plan for education of the handicapped as required by P.L. 94-142.

Other significant components of P.L. 94-482 include: assurances of handicapped representation on the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education; and an information system which yields data on the status of the handicapped in vocational education programs.

It is clear, given the nature of the statutes as they exist today with respect to handicapped youth, that the Congress was convinced of all of the following:

Handicapped youth were not enjoying anywhere near satisfactory access to vocational programs.

The vocational education of handicapped youth should be a major priority in the federal role in vocational education.

The ten percent set-aside was necessary if this inequitable access were to be reversed.

Even with the set-aside, state and local dollars were not being generated; therefore, a statutory match combined with an "excess cost" feature was required.

It was necessary that the vocational education of handicapped children be coordinated with the larger mission of P.L. 94-142, thus the requirement of conformance with the individualized educational program.

Recent testimony

Mr. Chairman, we have offered testimony twice in the last two years to this panel, testimony in which we discussed in some detail the strengths and weaknesses of the current statutes in vocational education and in which we offered our proposals for strengthening the statutes with respect to the full and appropriate participation of handicapped youth during the course of any future reauthorization. The dates of those testimonies were May 17, 1982 and November (for the written record), 1983.

Since we are rapidly moving toward the time of decision making by this committee, we will limit ourselves to a brief statement of the issues now specifically at hand and would respectfully refer you to our previous statements for more comprehensive comment and background.

The set-aside

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4164 in its present form excludes the 10 percent set-aside as currently in statute.

The first part of the alternative offered is a "hold harmless" at whatever level of appropriations exists in the last fiscal year under the terms of the existing statute. But a hold harmless is nothing more than a permanently frozen allocation level, rather than the critical motivation contained in a set-aside, namely, that those who fight for handicapped youth will realize proportionate gains if they work to increase the appropriations under the basic state grant program. In other words, a hold harmless is very unwise politics for everyone concerned about the basic program in vocational education.

The second part of the alternative offered in H.R. 4164 is the inclusion of handicapped youth in a new Part E along with other "special" populations. Let us simply say that the reaction from our colleagues around the nation to this proposal can only be characterized as truly resounding opposition.

Our opposition occurs for at least four reasons:

1. The inclusion of the set-aside in the basic state-local grant program, which has been and surely will remain the primary focus of federal appropriations and the main resource for direct program support and development, announced to the nation that meeting the vocational needs of handicapped youth was a top priority in the federal role in vocational education. Inclusion in the proposed Part E clearly says to us that such a status would cease.

2. Inclusion in the basic state-local program also clearly announced that handicapped youth were to be brought into the mainstream of regular vocational education. And, in point of fact, the states are now reporting that 74.7 percent of handicapped youth are being served in mainstream vocational education programs. This is a dramatic reversal of reports in the early 1970's, when it was reported that some 70 percent of handicapped youth were in separate vocational programs. Why do potential damage to this positive momentum? Or, to borrow the old adage: "If it isn't broke, why fix it?"

3. The structure of the proposed Part E in H.R. 4164 is disturbingly reminiscent of the block grant proposals of 1981 and 1982, which members of this committee will well remember. Our analysis shows that Part E could pit populations of children and their parents against each other in their struggle for a portion of the Part E allocation at the state and local levels. CEC would not want this situation to obtain for any of the populations proposed for inclusion, whether handicapped, women, of limited English proficiency, or economically disadvantaged. We oppose this block grant proposal as vigorously as we opposed the block grant proposals respecting handicapped and economically disadvantaged in 1981.

4. H.R. 4164 proposes a start-up authorization of $325 million for Part E, increasing to $500 million. This is indeed a large amount, but is it realizable? CEC has always worked, and will continue to work, diligently for needed increases in federal appropriations. But at a time when very committed proponents of the proposed mathematics and science education legislation are wondering whether the start-up appropriations of some $400 million for that bill is realizable, what are we realistically to expect in actual appropriations for Part E, which will surely be seen as a secondary and support program in vocational education?

Mr. Chairman, we reiterate our support for the set-aside within the basic state and local grant program (Part A of H.R. 4164), and reaffirm our position that the proposed alternatives in H.R. 4164 are dangerously regressive. We also endorse continuation of both the matching and excess cost requirements as current mechanisms working with the set-aside. Why? We are beginning to see in the basic data that the set-aside—especially when this committee added the matching and excess cost factors in the 1976 legislation—is at last causing concrete progress for handicapped youth.

	1974–75	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Total of handicapped enrolled in vocational education	263,064	284,065	344,041	360,151	235,988	400,575	555,961
Handicapped as a percentage of the total enrollment	1.7	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.6	3.3

During the school year 1980–81, vocational education served 555,961 handicapped students, comprising 3.3 percent of the total vocational education enrollment. This constitutes a 96 percent increase over the number of handicapped served in the 1975–76 school year, and a 38.8 percent increase over 1979–80. This period of growth corresponds precisely to the period in which the set-aside combined with matching and excess cost requirements have been in force in federal law.

	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Federal expenditures	$42,269,056	$44,758,161	$44,769,374	$53,140,457	$63,063,123	$68,448,286
State and local allocations	71,638,876	76,319,671	187,843,929	121,163,367	132,194,946	156,842,171

Progress in the allocation of state and local dollars for vocational education of the handicapped is also observable. Federal funds comprised 30.4 percent of total additional vocational service outlays for the handicapped in 1980–81, down from 32.3 percent in 1979–80. The non-federal to federal ratio increased from $2.10 to $1.00 in 1979–80, to $2.29 to $1.00 in 1980–81.

Moreover, with respect to all of the basic existing elements of the set-aside, an informal survey conducted in 1982 by the House Select Education Subcommittee has been instructive. The survey was directed to persons in State Departments of Education who are directly involved in the implementation of the set-aside provisions for handicapped youth. Responses to the survey were received from 28 states, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia. Respondents were asked, among other questions, how set-aside funds were used; and what would be the effect of the elimination of the set-aside and the matching requirements.

CEC's review of the data found that the following responses were consistently repeated:

The majority of the funds are used for support services for handicapped students in mainstream vocational education programs.

Elimination of the set-aside would cause a 30 percent to 60 percent decrease in enrollment and support services for handicapped students, with a few states indicating an eventual complete dismantling of support services.

Elimination of the current matching requirement would in some cases cause a significant decrease in services to handicapped students.

The consistent survey response to the question of the set-aside was that it should be preserved because its existence has initiated a positive trend in expanded access to vocational programs for handicapped students.

We would therefore again argue that it defies common sense to talk of discarding the very statutory mechanisms which are helping toward achievement of the first notable progress.

A 15-percent set-aside

The Council for Exceptional Children, along with other major national organizations concerned with the well being of handicapped youth, are requesting an increase in the current set-aside from 10 percent to 15 percent.

While placing stress on the progress which is at last occurring in enrollment of handicapped youth, we must also touch upon the "down side" of the available evidence. Again using the latest available figures, school year 1980–81, handicapped children and youth in special education now represent 9.5 percent of the total school age population in the nation. However, handicapped youth still represent only 3.3 percent of the total enrolled population in vocational education. Moreover, precisely the same percentages in enrollments are reflected in grades 9–12 in 1980–81. The National Center for Education Statistics reports a total enrollment in grades 9–12 of 13,317,000, with handicapped students comprising an estimated 9.5 percent of this group, totalling 1,265,115. Vocational education served 437,397 of the total number of handicapped students in grades 9–12, or 34.6 percent.

It is generally acknowledged professionally that his percentage is far too low, and must be remedied. Moreover, for a significant number of handicapped youth, unlike the nonhandicapped, vocational education is one of the very few viable options in preparation for an occupation. To put it another way, vocational education may be one of a number of valuable options for a non-handicapped youth, but may be the critically needed option for a handicapped youth.

We feel that such an increase is not only justified by the low enrollment numbers, but also by the urgent need to enhance the participation of handicapped youth across the full spectrum of vocational education options, as well as to enhance the participation of handicapped youth in programs of true quality in the least restrictive environment.

It has become clear that further fiscal support for general program development along with continued fiscal support for direct program purposes are required. Therefore, we support the approach to an additional 5 percent being offered by Representative Austin Murphy, your colleague on the Education and Labor Committee and Chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee. Mr. Murphy's proposal would allow the states and local recipients the option of using the additional 5 percent for both direct service and for other activities related to the vocational education of handicapped youth, including vocational assessment, teacher training, curriculum development, equipment and machinery adaptation, and research and development.

In conclusion

Mr. Chairman, in our previous testimony in 1982 and 1983 we have cited and discussed other, relatively modest, improvements which the Council seeks in the vocational education statutes on behalf of handicapped youth, their parents, and the professionals who serve them.

These have included:

Improved participation in national, state and local advisories;

Improved participation in planning at all governmental levels;

A stronger administrative role in the U.S. Department of Education;

Improved information gathering and analysis through the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS);

An improved national research emphasis;

Stronger linkage with the requirements in federal statutes respecting special education and rehabilitation; and

Improved program evaluation at all levels.

Representative Austin Murphy has prepared a package of amendments to H.R. 4164 with respect to handicapped students. This package addresses both the set-aside question as well as many of the issues cited above. The Council wholeheartedly endorses the entire package of Murphy amendments, and hopes that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this panel, will also affirm them.

In that vein, you will find attached to this testimony a letter to Mr. Murphy from member organizations of the Education Task Force of the Consortium Concerned with Developmental Disabilities. Parenthetically, we are advised that other organizations will soon be adding their endorsement to Mr. Murphy's package.

We thank you again for the opportunity to present these comments. CEC stands ready, as always, to assist this committee in the fulfillment of its legislative mission on behalf of exceptional children.

CONSORTIUM CONCERNED WITH THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED,
February 6, 1984.

Hon. AUSTIN MURPHY,
Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee, House of Representatives, 2537 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: We are writing to you as the Education Task Force of the Consortium Concerned with Developmental Disabilities, a standing coalition of the major organizations who speak for and work on behalf of the educational needs of disabled Americans. In that capacity, we wish to express our strong support for the amendments which you are offering to H.R. 4164, which bill is the likely vehicle for House reauthorization of the federal Vocational Education Act.

Undoubtedly in large measure because of the existing statutory requirements of a ten percent set-aside of funds for handicapped youth coupled with matching and excess cost requirements, slow but significant progress is observable in the participation of handicapped youth in vocational education programs nationwide. During the school year 1980–81, vocational education served 555,961 handicapped students, comprising 3.3 percent of the total vocational education enrollment. This constitutes a 96 percent increase over the number of handicapped served in the 1975–76 school year, and a 38.8 percent increase over 1979–80. This period of growth corresponds precisely to the period in which the set-aside combined with matching and excess cost requirements have been in force in federal law.

Progress in the allocation of state and local dollars for vocational education of the handicapped is also observable. Federal funds comprised 30.4 percent of total additional vocational service outlays for the handicapped in 1980–81, down from 32.3

35-667 O - 84 - 3

percent in 1979–80. The non-federal to federal ratio increased from $2.10 to $1.00 in 1979–80, to $2.29 to $1.00 in 1980–81.

It is an affront to common sense to talk of discarding the very statutory mechanisms which are helping toward achievement of the first notable progress. We therefore stand behind your amendment to H.R. 4164 in this area which would both sustain and enhance the current momentum.

At the same time, much greater progress is urgently required, in number of handicapped youth enrolled in vocational education, in participation of handicapped youth across the full spectrum of vocational education programs, and the participation of handicapped youth in programs of true quality in the least restrictive settings. Therefore, we also support your proposal for a 15 percent set-aside. We understand and approve of the utilization of the additional 5 percent for both direct program support and general program development, including the urgent need for personnel development. Your proposal to move from a 10 percent to a 15 percent set-aside is also justified by the overall proposed fiscal arrangement outlined in the current H.R. 4164, where proportionally larger amounts of future appropriations would be allocated to specific-purpose programs outside of the authority of the basic state-local (Part A) program.

We also support your other amendments being offered to strengthen in important ways the participation of handicapped youth, the professionals who serve them, and those who otherwise speak for them in various aspects of the total vocational education picture, including planning, research, removal of barriers and adaptation of equipment, stronger interaction with federal requirements in both special education and rehabilitation, national, state, and local advisory activities, and program evaluation.

All of the organizations signing this letter trust that your entire package of amendments will be affirmed during deliberations within the Education and Labor Committee, and will work to that end. We thank you for your attention and your leadership in this vital concern.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick J. Weintraub, Chairperson, on behalf of the signatories: American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Inc.; Association for Children with Learning Disabilities; Association for Retarded Citizens; American Speech-Language-Hearing Association; American Physical Therapy Association; Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc.; Child Welfare League; The Epilepsy Foundation of America; National Society for Children & Adults with Autism; Spina Bifida Association of America; The Council for Exceptional Children.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Jane Razeghi, you go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF JANE ANN RAZEGHI, DIRECTOR, EDUCATION AND TRAINING, AMERICAN COALITION OF CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. RAZEGHI. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. We will withhold our questions until you get through. Go right ahead.

Ms. RAZEGHI. OK, thank you.

Chairman Perkins, staff and members of the subcommittee.

My name is Jane Ann Razeghi and I am currently the director of Education and Training for the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, referred to in this testimony quite often as ACCD.

The American Coalition is an umbrella organization made up of over 140 national, State, and local disability organizations in this country.

We attempt the impossible: To bring cross disability organizations and individuals together to present a united voice on those issues that are of common concern.

Education is just one of those issues and vocational education in particular is the issue that we are going to be discussing today.

I would just like to share with you that among our organizations are the American Council of the Blind. National Association of the Deaf, United Cerebral Palsy, just to mention a few of the 140.

I am pleased to mention this morning that we have three other organizations that we are representing in this testimony today. The National Society for Children and Adults with Autism; and two of the key parent consumer organizations who actually benefit from the opportunities that currently exist in vocational education today, and that is the Association for Retarded Citizens and the National Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities. We are pleased to have them with us and we sincerely appreciate your invitation to testify here today to hear our voice.

I would just like to say that during the past 6 years, the American Coalition has been actively involved in vocational education, training about the opportunities for handicapped individuals in this country. We have worked with and trained disabled adults, parents of handicapped children, about the opportunities that exist.

We have got special vocational education advisory committee members together trying to work together, an interagency cooperation. We have published materials and training materials on this subject as it concerns handicapped individuals.

I would have to say that in light of our many activities the Coalition has really assumed a leadership position in terms of the disability community in this country regarding vocational education for handicapped individuals. That is just to give you a little background about where we are coming from today.

I would also like to add a personal aside that for the past 6 years I have been a member of the American Vocational Association, the Special Needs Division and the NAVSNP, the National Association of Vocational Special Needs Personnel. I have to keep up with what is going on there.

The disability community—before I go into those remarks I would like to just say that the disability community does support a strong vocational education system in this country and fully support the concept in the effort here to obtain full appropriations for it. We are behind it 100 percent. We would just like to be kind of a part of that action, if you know what I mean.

Despite the fact that an obvious effort has been made in H.R. 4164 to be attentive to the needs of the handicapped in certain areas and in certain sections, the disability community and the organizations that I represent here today, honestly feel that this bill is a drastic change to the status quo.

What our organizations cannot quite figure out is why this bill attempts to fix or change something that we feel those who are benefiting from us is already working satisfactorily.

We believe that if it is passed in its present form that it is going to create dire circumstances for the continued participation of handicapped in vocational education in the country.

And in consideration of time, the disability community would just like to make five major points regarding this bill. I would like you to keep in mine that we are not making drastic demands for changes. Our first three points are really advocating the status quo. We feel it is working well. The last two points I guess you

would call program improvement. We are not making dramatic changes. So please keep that in mind.

Our first point is that this bill eliminates the current set-aside which already exists for handicapped students in the basic State grant. The disability community wishes to restore the set-aside in the basic grant at the rate of 15 percent.

The second point is that this bill eliminates the critical role and the purpose of the excess cost requirement. The disability community would like to see this restored and extended to include separate programs.

Our third point is that the bill places handicapped students in a new, separate part E program for special needs and we, the disability community, would not like to participate in part E.

The fourth point is that the bill identifies a variety of program improvements and support activities that we think are very positive, such as vocational assessment, placement services, research and development. And the disability community would just like to assure the role of handicapped individuals in these very critical and positive activities.

Finally, we feel that the bill does not promote the participation of severely handicapped students in voc-ed. And we would like to see their participation promoted.

The remainder of this testimony is just going to be a brief presentation of the disability community's concerns with each of these five points and very brief recommendations for improvement.

In terms of the first point, that the bill eliminates the current set-aside for handicapped individuals in the basic State grant and that we would like to see this restored in the basic State grant at the rate of 15 percent.

I think testimony of Dr. Hasazi, we share some of the same reasons for this—I think that the disability community feels that the bill really presents us with a total rewrite of the funding mechanism for the role of the Federal dollar in vocational education regarding handicapped individuals' participation in it.

And we feel already—if I haven't made the point before—that there has been substantial progress, as Dr. Hasazi pointed out, in terms of providing equal access for handicapped individuals.

On page 4 of my written testimony there is a chart that we also seem to share with the Council of Exceptional Children—and I know Dr. Hasazi has made those points—but again, just briefly, when you see the period of time that the excess cost requirement in the set-aside had been in effect, starting in 1974 through the present system, the total number of handicapped students enrolled in voc-ed have increased. The percentages you look at you may not think that 1.7 to 3.3 percent is a significant increase, but the bottom line there, as Dr. Hasazi pointed out, is that in the past they had been a nice little separate but equal programs, which we kind of feel is a civil rights issue in this particular instance.

But now they have moved out of those separate programs to benefitting from the mainstream situation. So we feel that extremely positive—a very good benefit.

And on line 3, you note that it is true, as Dr. Bottom pointed out, that the Federal expenditures really have not increased significantly for handicapped students through the years. But when you

look at line 4, the State and local allocations have increased dramatically.

So we conclude from that, and as we presented in our written testimony, that the Federal dollar has acted as a catalyst to generate more State and local dollars. We view this as very positive.

Now, why are we requesting a 15-percent set-aside? The disability community views vocational education as one of the key employment preparation options for handicapped individuals in this country.

The written testimony goes into a lot of statistics and a review of the employment preparation options.

I would just like to say in summary that of 36 million disabled individuals in this country, only about 40 percent are employed and most of them earn $7,000 per year, or less, and many of them earn $2,000 a year or less.

Even though section 504 of the Voc-Rehab Act says that you cannot discriminate against a qualified handicapped individual on the basis of the handicap and condition, the big question in this country is how do handicapped youth become qualified? And there are not too many options. Voc-Rehab in a good year can case close successfully only about 53,000. That, in comparison to over 350,000 special ed students leaving the public school system each year, is very small in comparison to the whole effort. And voc-rehab can only serve those who are severely disabled, who are capable of being prepared for employment. So that limits their being able to serve youth. Apprenticeship programs, zero population disability. Military does not recruit disabled youth.

So, when you look at vocational education, it is one of those federally funded programs that receives minimum Federal dollars that is really the most accessible, and has been the most successful, as well as accessible, to handicapped individuals in this country.

I won't dwell on that except to say that the disability community does feel that with 3.3-percent enrollment currently, and we view that positively, we feel that there can be many more individuals served—many more handicapped individuals and youth served in vocational education.

So that is basically why we are asking for the increase to 15 percent.

Our recommendation is that in order to enable handicapped students to continue in the mainstream—in the mainstream of vocational education—and in order to include additional handicapped students, we would like the set-aside restored in the basic State grant and increased to 15 percent.

If it is eliminated from the State grant, which has been there for years, our concern, of course, is that, you know, handicapped individuals are just not going to get served. We feel that mandate has to be there.

The second point is that the bill eliminates the critical role and the purpose of the excess cost requirement. We want to see that excess cost language continuned in H.R. 4164.

Again, our basic point here is that the two things—the two congressional initiatives that have been the catalyst and have made these improvements currently are the set-aside and the excess cost language and requirement.

And, again, I think the data that we present in the written testimony clearly indicates that the funds of the catalyst and we would like to see that continued, and the funds do cover, or should be used to cover, the excess cost of handicapped individuals in vocational education.

There are a couple of studies, such as the General Accounting Office report, that clearly indicate that individuals were in separate programs in the past but now they are in mainstream programs. That is presented in the written testimony, again supporting the fact that we really feel that the status quo is successful. And that the underlying purpose of the excess cost requirement is to generate State and local moneys in equitably serving handicapped individuals.

We feel that if the excess cost requirement is eliminated—if it is eliminated—this is going to have a very negative impact on handicapped individuals in this country. It is going to make it more economically feasible to fund separate segregated programs for handicapped individuals which could be fully supported by Federal funds.

In addition, we feel that if you allow Federal funds to be used for full support of vocational education programs you are going to significantly reduce the number of handicapped students that are going to be able to participate in those programs.

A recommendation: The excess cost mechanism should be restored and also extended to include separate programs.

Our third point, and it is a brief one, is that the bill places handicapped students in this new, separate part E special needs program. And the disability community would really like not to participate in that for, I think, obvious reasons. It is almost as if the bill were written as if the current vocational education statute and regulations were not doing the job.

We are not complaining. We are very happy with the status quo mechanisms. And, again, we would like to reaffirm the points that we made in 1 and 2 of this testimony that we feel that the current statute in the regulatory language are doing a fine job for handicapped individuals in this country.

We feel that if placing handicapped students into the new separate part E for special needs students is basically a nonmainstream approach.

I hate to say this but it is almost as if H.R. 4164, as it is written right now—and there can be a few changes made to clear this up—it looks as if it is written to benefit predominantly the white male population of this country. And we are going back to before the set-asides—we are shifting all of these populations over to a separate program, a separate approach, back from the mainstream.

Anyway, it is the belief of the disability community that putting disabled individuals back into a separate program approach with a number of other special needs populations will in effect be designating disabled people back to the separate program approach as opposed to the current congressional intent and mandate of mainstreaming.

Therefore, a recommendation is to remove handicapped individuals from part E back into the basic State grant, restore the set-

aside, increasing it from 10 to 15 percent with the excess cost requirement.

The fourth point—the bill identifies a wonderful array of program improvements and support activities. I won't mention all of them but I do want to say that if handicapped individuals are not identified as eligible for receipt of these programs, the effect of vocational education for them is not as effective as it should be. And I would just like to make one example of this.

One of the things we did about 1½ years ago was train all the State education agency personnel in this country about how to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and handicapping condition in vocational education.

And one of the things the staff found out as we went around from State to State is the fact that, for example, guidance and counseling are almost nonexistent for handicapped individuals at the secondary level. And improvements and expansion of these services to include handicapped would improve their employment capabilities tremendously.

This one support activity—just one—impacts, first of all, and they are even getting into vocational education programs. And, second, they are getting into employment placements.

Time doesn't really allow for us to go into greater detail on how some of the other activities do impact on disabled individuals when they are not allowed to be at least considered eligible for these programs.

ACCD, as you can imagine, has been concerned with underrepresentation and segregation of handicapped individuals in voc-ed programs for quite some time.

OCR reports that most of the handicapped individuals still today are in the lower level ooccupational preparation areas. We would like to see that changed and that because, again, of the guidance and counseling issue, many handicapped individuals are not being given the opportunity to prepare for higher levels of employment and, therefore, cannot be considered qualified for employment in these areas.

Again, our recommendation in this particular point is that handicapped individuals should be at least identified as eligible recipients of the bills, programs improvements, and support services.

The last point—that the bill does not promote the participation of severely handicapped individuals in vocational education.

When you look at the separate programs or any vocational setting you don't see the severely handicapped enrolled at all. We have presented written studies in our written report. The blind, the deaf, the orthopedically impaired, multihandicapped, and other health impaired, they are just not included, not even in the separate programs.

So we would think that with the increase in the percentage of the basic State grant that effort could be made to recruit them.

Remember that some individuals with average or above intelligence who are physically impaired could also benefit from the high-tech programs that are being advocated now by AVA. And we do believe that voc-ed programs should be available regardless of a person's handicapping and condition.

So our recommendation, again, is that the participation of severely handicapped individuals should be promoted in voc-ed.

In conclusion, it is really the purpose of this testimony to impress upon the chairman and the members of the committee that there are some five major concerns that the disability community seeks in the five changes.

We don't think we are making unreasonable requests and that they are: No. 1, to restore the set-aside which exists in the current legislation, back into the basic State grant at a 15-percent level.

Second, to restore the excess cost mechanism and extend it to separate programs.

Third, to remove handicapped individuals from part E and put them back into the basic State grant.

Four, to include handicapped individuals as eligible for the program improvements and support activities already identified in the bill.

And, finally, to promote the participation of severely handicapped individuals in voc-ed.

As it currently stands, the H.R. 4164 does not include these requests, and because of that we really feel that the needs of handicapped individuals cannot really be effectively met, even as effectively as they are being met currently. And not only that, that it will eliminate the benefits and opportunities to handicapped individuals in this country.

Representative Austin Murphy has introduced a package of amendments which address the set-aside and the other issues raised in this particular testimony.

The disability community and the organizations that I represent here today wholeheartedly endorse this package and hope that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee will do the same. And if you do, then I feel very strongly that the disability community will also be able to wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 4164.

Thank you for your time.

[Prepared statement of Jane Ann Razeghi follows:]

STATEMENT OF JANE ANN RAZEGHI, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR THE AMERICAN COALITION OF CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman Perkins, Staff and Members of the Subcommittee: My name is Jane Ann Razeghi. I am the Director of Education and Training for the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Inc. (ACCD). ACCD is a nationwide umbrella organization representing over 140 national, state, and local organizations of and for disabled people. Included among our membership are such organizations as the American Council of the Blind, the National Association of the Deaf, and the United Cerebral Palsy Associations, all of which have a deep and direct interest in vocational education for handicapped individuals. Also joining us today in support of this particular testimony are three major parent organizations, the Association for Retarded Citizens, the National Society for Children and Adults with Autism, and the national Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities. We appreciate your invitations to testify here today.

During the past six years, ACCD has been actively involved in training about the importance of vocational education as one of the key employment preparation options that should be available to all disabled individuals for whom it is deemed appropriate. In this regard, we have trained disabled individuals; parents of handicapped children; vocational and special education advisory council members; and special and vocational administrators and educators. ACCD has also developed a number of publications and training materials on the subject of vocational education for handicapped individuals, parents, and educators. In addition, it has trained State Education Agency personnel in all states about how to eliminate discrimina-

tion in vocational education on the basis of race (Title VI), sex (Title IX), and handicapping condition (Section 504) based on the Guidelines regulations. ACCD has assumed a leadership role in the disability community regarding vocational education for handicapped individuals.

I would also like to add the fact that for the past six years, I have been a member of the American Vocational Association (AVA), it Special Needs Division and its affiliate, the National Association of Vocational Special Needs Personnel (NAVSNP).

Despite the fact that an obvious effort was made in H.R. 4164 to be attentive to the needs of handicapped individuals in certain sections and to certain degrees, ACCD, and the organizations that I represent here today, want the Chairman and members of the Committee to realize that we consider H.R. 4164 a drastic change to the status quo. What our organization cannot figure out is why this bill attempts to fix something that is already working satisfactorily. We believe that if it is passed in its present form, it will create dire circumstances for the continued participation of handicapped individuals in vocational education. In the consideration of time, there are only five major points that we would like to make:

1. H.R. 4164 eliminates the current setaside for handicapped individuals in the basic state grant and the disability community seeks to restore the setaside in the basic grant at 15%.

2. H.R. 4164 eliminates the critical role and purpose of the current excess cost provisions. The disability community seeks to have the excess cost mechanism restored and extended to separate programs.

3. H.R. 4164 places handicapped students in a new separate Part E for special needs and the disability community does not wish to participate in Part E.

4. H.R. 4164 identifies a variety of program improvements and support activities such as vocational assessment, research and development, personnel preparation, curriculum development, placement services, etc. The disability community seeks to insure their role in these critical activities.

5. H.R. 4164 does not promote the participation of severely handicapped students in vocational education and the disability community desires to promote their participation.

The remainder of this testimony will present the disability community's concerns with each of the five points identified above and suggest recommendations for improvement.

1. H.R. 4164 eliminates the current setaside for handicapped individuals in the basis state grant and the disability community seeks to restore the setaside in the basic grant at 15%.

H.R. 4164 presents the disability community with a total rewrite of the funding mechanism for the role of the federal dollar for handicapped individual's participation in vocational education. The disability community believes that there has been substantial progress made toward providing equal access for handicapped individuals.

The following table is presented to substantiate this belief and note that it indicates a substantial increase in the numbers of handicapped individuals served as well as the Federal resource allocations, and state/local expenditures.

1. Total of handicapped individuals enrolled in Vocational Education:

1974–75	263,064
1975–76	284,065
1976–77	344,041
1977–78	355,269
1978–79	437,500

2. Handicapped students as a percentage of the total enrollment:

	Percent
1974–75	1.7
1975–76	1.8
1976–77	2.1
1977–78	2.1
1978–79	2.5

3. Federal expenditures:

1974–75	42,813,946
1975–76	42,269,056
1976–77	44,758,161
1977–78	51,651,331
1978–79	53,833,995

4. State and local allocations:

1974–75	56,119,820
1975–76	71,638,876
1976–77	76,319,671
1977–78	187,843,929
1978–79	(1)

[1] Not available.

Note the increase in state and local resources committed to vocational education services for handicapped individuals. This would indicate that the intent for the Federal assistance to serve as a catalyst is being met. Additionally, the number of rehabilitated vocational rehabilitation clients whose services were provided by vocational schools have increased by almost ten percent in the period from 1977–1980.

Why a 15% Setaside?

ACCD views vocational education as one of the few key employment preparation options for handicapped individuals. The statistics and information presented below provide the basic rationale for increasing the setaside particularly in light of the other employment preparation options.

The statistics below demonstrate that handicapped people are disproportionately represented in our nation's workforce as well as in major education, training, and employment programs whose primary purpose has been to assist individuals to access the world of work. Training and employment problems encountered by handicapped individuals are clearly evident in the following facts:

Employment

Only 40% of the adult disabled population is employed as compared to 74% of the nondisabled population (Levitan & Taggart, 1976).

85% of those disabled individuals employed earned less than $7,000 per year, and many of these individuals earned less than $2,000 per year (Bow, 1980).

50% of all U.S. residents who do not participate in the labor force are disabled (Bowe, 1980).

76% of all disabled women are unemployed (Bowe, 1980).

Training

In Fiscal Year 1978, handicapped individuals represented only 2.1% of the total enrollments in secondary vocational education programs and 1.7% of the postsecondary enrollments (Office for Civil Rights, 1980). Current enrollment data reflects approximately 3% of the total enrollment to be handicapped persons.

Fiscal Year 1978 enrollment data from the U.S. Department of Labor indicate that handicapped youth represented less than 5% of the participants in CETA Youth Programs (Jones, 1977).

Of particular concern is the underenrollment of handicapped individuals in vocational education and training programs in light of affirmative action mandates (Section 503, P.L. 93–112) which have been placed on employers. Section 504, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap (Federal Register, Wednesday, May 4, 1977), specifically directs employers not to discriminate against "qualified handicapped individuals." It also affirms vocational education accessibility for handicapped students.

ACCD contends that providing appropriate vocational education to handicapped individuals should be considered a major intervention strategy to provide for the development of the necessary competencies to enable handicapped individuals to become qualified for reemployment.

At the same time employers seek qualified handicapped individuals, disabled people are looking for ways to become "qualified." Many would argue that the whole purpose and funding of vocational rehabilitation is to vocationally prepare disabled persons. The reality is that while vocational rehabilitation services provide assistance to some disabled people, the program is so small that it can affect only a small number of employment training needs.

For example, in 1980, vocational rehabilitation reported that it successfully closed 53,000 cases for individuals under the age of 20 years. Unfortunately, 53,000 closed cases, even though successfully service, is small in comparision to the total need especially in light of the fact that over 350,000 handicapped youth leave the public schools on an annual basis. It is obvious that vocational rehabilitation cannot provide services for everyone.

While the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) reportedly served 110,000 persons aged 16–21 years in 1981, it should be noted that the new Job Train-

ing Partnership Act (JTPA) which replaced the CETA legislation no longer considers handicapped youth eligible as under CETA. Instead, only handicapped individuals with a second disadvantagement, i.e., economic—will be considered eligible to participate in JTPA programs.

Therefore, in light of the various federally funded systems in which the federal government takes a significant role in supporting employment training (the military JTPA, business, industry, apprenticeships, universities and colleges, public vocational education, and proprietary schools), public vocational education, which exists with a minimum of federal support, appears to be the most accessible.

RECOMMENDATION

In order to enable handicapped individuals to continue in the mainstream of vocational education, and in order to include additional handicapped individuals in vocational education, the setaside should be restored in the basic state grant and increased to 15%.

2. H.R. 4164 eliminates the critical role and purpose of the current excess cost provisions. The disability community seeks to have the excess cost mechanism restored and extended to separate programs.

The second major point is that, basically, the Congressional initiatives which have assisted handicapped individuals in obtaining a greater degree of participation in vocational education are (1) as mentioned previously, the current setaside for handicapped individuals, which is matched by state and local funds, and (2) the requirement that these funds be limited to the "excess cost" of educating handicapped students in vocational education (excess cost mechanism).

The legislative history and the Act indicate that Federal assistance should serve as a catalyst to induce state educational agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to align priorities, programs and expenditures more closely to community and individual needs. The statistics in the chart presented in point one of this testimony clearly show that the Federal funds are serving as an effective catalyst for handicapped students. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 required the States to spend at least 10% of their annual basic grants on programs and services for handicapped individuals. These setaside funds were intended to be spent for costs in excess of the costs of providing vocational education for nonhandicapped student, though funds could be used to pay the entire cost of programs devised solely for handicapped students.

The history of the Act clearly indicated that the setaside funds were to be used, to the maximum extent possible, to assist handicapped individuals to participate in "mainstream" vocational education programs. In a report prepared for the former H.E.W. Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation in 1973, the Olympus Research Corporation reported that, despite the existence of policy calling for integration, approximately seventy percent of students receiving vocational education were in separate vocational classes. The General Accounting Office reported that in the first four years of implementation of the 1968 Amendments little progress had been made in increasing the enrollments of handicapped individuals in vocational education or stimulating increased state and local support for such activities.

It wasn't until 1976 that Amendments to the Vocational Education Act contained provisions intended to increase the priority for participation of handicapped students in vocational education. The Amendments required states to match the Federal funds earmarked for handicapped individuals. The regulations require the Federal funds to be held to expenditures for extra or supplemental expenditures for students in "regular" programs.

The disability community attests that the gains that have been made are directly related to the excess cost provision. The provision has ensured that the Federal funds would be used to supplement rather than supplant the level of state and local funds made available for vocational programs. The matching requirement has contributed to the increase in state and local funds.

The following example is provided to illustrate what would happen if the excess cost requirement was removed:

Example: A deaf student in a "regular" autobody program needs an interpreter and specialized counseling services. The per pupil cost of the program for nonhandicapped students is $1,000 and the additional cost for the interpreter and counseling is $500. Under the present requirements the Federal funds could be used to pay half of the excess costs, $250, on the other hand, if the excess cost requirement was removed, Federal funds would then be used to pay the total cost, $1,500.

The underlying purpose of the excess cost requirement is to generate state and local moneys in equitably serving handicapped individuals.

The elimination of the purpose of the excess cost requirement would have a negative impact on handicapped students by (1) denying handicapped individuals the opportunity to benefit from the basic course which on the average would exceed 90% non-federal expenditures and, (2) making it more economically feasible to fund separate, segregated programs for handicapped individuals which could be fully supported by Federal funds. Additionally, allowing the Federal funds to be used for full support for vocational education for handicapped persons would significantly reduce the number of individuals who could participate.

RECOMMENDATION

The excess cost mechanism should be restored and extended to separate programs.

3. H.R. 4164 places handicapped students in a new separate Part E for special needs and the disability community does not wish to participate in Part E.

H.R. 4164 appears to have developed Part E as if the current vocational education statute and regulations were not effectively serving handicapped individuals. Again, the disability community wishes to reaffirm point one and two of this testimony which attest to vocational education's current statute and regulatory provisions for handicapped students.

The disability community does believe that placing handicapped students into a new separate Part E for special needs is a nonmainstreamed approach. A review of 1978-80 Vocational Education Data System Enrollment data indicates that seventy-seven percent of handicapped individuals reported as enrolled in vocational education were participating in "regular" vocational education programs. Because of the large percentage of handicapped students enrolled in "regular" programs, strong argument could be made that the per capita cost has been reduced, i.e., we are now serving more for less money.

It is the belief of the disability community that putting disabled individuals back into a separate program with a number of other special needs populations will in effect, be designating disabled people back to a separate program approach, as opposed to the current Congressional intent and mandate of mainstreaming.

RECOMMENDATION

Remove handicapped individuals from Part E back into the basic grant and restore the setaside, increasing it from 10% to 15%.

4. H.R. 4164 identifies a variety of program improvements and support activities such as vocational assessment, research and development, personnel preparation, curriculum development, placement services, etc. The disability community seeks to insure their role in these critical activities.

Although extensive data are not available, it is the belief of the disability community that without the inclusion of handicapped concerns in the above mentioned support activities and program improvements, and the additional ones identified in H.R. 4164, that the participation of handicapped individuals in vocational education will not be truly effective.

For example, while training State Education personnel one and one-half years ago on eliminating discrimination in vocational education on the basis of race, sex, and handicapping condition, ACCD's staff learned that guidance and counseling services were virtually nonexistent for secondary aged handicapped students in this country. Improvements and expansion of these services to include handicapped individuals could improve their employment capabilities. Counseling affects both placement in vocational education programs as well as placement in employment.

ACCD has long been concerned with underrepresentation and segregation of handicapped individuals in vocational education programs. When the number of handicapped individuals participating in programs which lead to higher skill level occupations are compared to the enrollments of handicapped individuals in programs which would be considered training for lower skilled occupations, it appears that the handicapped individuals reported to be enrolled in vocational programs tend to be clustered in ones which prepare for lower level occupations (Office for Civil Rights, 1980). The clustering of enrollments in these lower level occupational preparation programs supports the concerns expressed by handicapped individuals in vocational education programs. Because handicapped individuals are not prepared for higher levels of employment, they can not be considered qualified for employment in these areas.

Requirements should be established that clearly limit the placement of handicapped individuals in segregated programs or that track those individuals into lower level occupational training areas. Only when it is clearly demonstrated that the nature and severity of the individual's handicap even with maximum support serv-

ices, prohibits participation in a "regular" vocational program, should a separate vocational preparation program be considered.

These are representative of just the problems that are created not by including and identifying handicapped individuals as eligible for one such vocational support service. Time does not permit going into examples of exclusion from additional services and improvements.

RECOMMENDATION

Handicapped individuals should be included as eligible recipients of H.R. 4164's program improvements and support services.

5. H.R. 4164 does not promote the participation of severely handicapped students in vocational education and the disability community desires to promote their participation.

Based on information that ACCD has received, when one looks at the totals and percentages of handicapped students who were enrolled in separate vocational programs, few, if any, are severely disabled students. Participation of deaf, orthopedically impaired, multihandicapped, blind/deaf, and other impaired, students in any vocational setting, even "separate"—is nonexistent.

Of all the disabled students receiving vocational education at the secondary level (2-3% of the total yearly enrollment at the secondary level are disabled), it is the more severely disabled students who have had the greatest difficulty gaining any access whatsoever.

In addition, the Report by the Secretary of Education indicates that of all the disabled students in separate programs, few were severely disabled.

The needs of some severely disabled students are so great that even with the best of support services many would not benefit from mainstreaming into regular vocational education. On the other hand, some severely disabled students, due to orthopedic and other physical impairments, may still be able to benefit in the various high tech vocational programs with appropriate modifications and/or support services.

The disability community believes that vocational education programs should be available regardless of a person's handicapping condition.

RECOMMENDATION

The participation of severely handicapped individuals should be promoted in vocational education.

In conclusion, the purpose of this testimony is to impress upon the Chairman and members of this Committee that there are major concerns in H.R. 4164 in terms of the disability community and that it seeks the following five changes:

(1) Restoration of the setaside, which exists currently in legislation, back into the basic state grant at a 15% level.

(2) Restoration of the excess cost mechanism and its extension to separate programs.

(3) Deletion of handicapped individuals from Part E back to the basic state grant.

(4) Inclusion of handicapped individuals as eligible for the variety of program improvements and support activities identified and described in H.R. 4164.

(5) Promotion of the participation of severely handicapped individuals in vocational education programs that meet their unique needs.

H.R. 4164, as it currently exists, does not include the above requests and does not meet the needs of handicapped individuals as effectively as they are currently being met today under the existing statute and regulations.

Representative Austin Murphy has introduced a package of Amendments which address the setaside and other issues raised in this testimony. ACCD wholeheartedly endorses this package and hopes that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this Committee will do the same.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank all of you for excellent testimony. But I want to make an observation and ask all of you a question. Let all of you respond to it.

Somewhere along the line it is my hope that we may be able to obtain a meeting of minds. Now, I think all of you realize the money problem we are having—the program is funded at about $735 million today. We were spending more money than that in fiscal year 1980. If we considered inflation, to maintain our level of

service in 1980, we should go up to around a $1 billion today. But I am afraid we will not be able to obtain that money. I will do my best to obtain it. I think we should have a $1½ billion—a $1½ billion myself.

I travel through the Appalachian area—in those vocations schools down home we have waiting lists of 3,000—most of them high school dropouts—wanting to take training, and they can't take training. There is no room for them. And the States have tightened up on their money. The local school districts have tightened up on their money.

If we had the money, we could settle this problem in 5 minutes. But we don't have that money. It could be might easily settled.

Now, let's consider that the Vocational Education Act has a lower appropriation today than it did in 1980. The act also has been pretty much level-funded for the last 2 years.

In light of these facts, let me ask two questions. Now, I am asking the questions to all of you. Dr. Bottoms and Dr. Parnell can answer first.

You are proposing increasing the postsecondary set-aside from 15 to 30 percent in your bill. Now, Dr. Brody-Hasazi and Ms. Razeghi, you are proposing increasing the set-aside for the handicapped from 10 percent in the current level to 15 percent.

Now, how are we going to do all this if the funds aren't there? And won't we be taking money from other vocational programs to put into these postsecondary and handicapped programs? You answer first, Dr. Bottons, and Dr. Parnell.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Go ahead.

Mr. PARNELL. First of all, the 30 percent set-aside for postsecondary is inadequate. And all you are probably doing is bringing the law up to standard practice. In the majority of the States it would be more than that. So I don't think that you are shifting money—you may in a few States be shifting some money.

Chairman PERKINS. You mean to tell me that it is inaccurate that the vocational schools don't have long waiting lists? Do you say that is inaccurate?

Mr. PARNELL. Oh, no, that is a different question.

Chairman PERKINS. If you say it is inaccurate I want to take you and show you.

Mr. PARNELL. The question you asked me was about the postsecondary set-aside. The question with regard to long waiting lists is absolutely accurate and particularly in areas where there is fairly sure employment at the end of the line.

Chairman PERKINS. How do you justify increasing your set-aside? I mean with this lower amount of money.

Mr. PARNELL. The first part of the answer is that in the vast majority of the States it is already at that amount, or more.

The second part of the answer is that we are shifting to a tremendous volume of adults in this country that we need to look at—and I am talking about the great middle quartiles of the country. How are we going to keep them working in a shifting technology?

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say one word about the handicapped. I began working on the handicapped legislation when I came to the Congress in 1949. I was reared in a mining community—I saw these miners all mashed up in their lumbar and dorsal spines,

every way in the world; and they would die in bed; they would get a little workmen's compensation, and that was all.

We all want to support the handicapped every way that we possibly can. But how do you justify the increase assuming we don't have the funds—the funds are not being increased? And the disadvantaged, by the hundreds of thousands, can't get into vocational schools. Go ahead.

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. Thank you.

That is a tough question. I have been thinking about it and in thinking about the whole purpose of the Vocational Education Act and the way in which Federal dollars should be used, it is my opinion that what we are talking about is not necessarily increasing and just continuing to increase the dollars but, rather, limiting the focus of the Federal dollars in vocational education to a smaller number of outcomes. Rather than what the NIE report has suggested and that is being that vocational education has been trying to do too much for too many.

So our approach would be to use the Federal dollars on a more targeted purpose such as providing services to increase access for handicapped and disadvantaged individuals. And that would be my response.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you want to answer?

Ms. RAZEGHI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to make a brief comment or response to that.

In a sense it is a certain matter of perspective in two ways. First of all, as Members of Congress, I know that you are probably more aware and sensitive to the budget needs of the entire country.

One thing that I didn't mention in my testimony—and perhaps the record can stay open and I can still present it—is the high cost of disability in this country. Over $114 billion or more annually spent on maintaining handicapped individuals instead of trying to put some of that money into the educational process and training them and getting them out. And we have the studies that they can be trained—and I didn't present them.

But I think that is a consideration that you can justify an extra percent or at least maintaining the status quo on voc-ed just in that regard alone.

Second, you can approach from this perspective, perhaps, and you may not like it. To ask the question who will benefit most from participating in vocational education? Those individuals who are most likely to succeed without the intervention of voc-ed or those most likely to succeed that need it most. In other words, handicapped, disadvantaged, women, whatever. That is something you might want to keep in mind.

A lot of the attitudinal problems in getting handicapped individuals into vocational education is that in many tech schools and many tech programs they generally take the cream of the crop. It is really hard to be in the high school situation, as I was for well over 10 years, and to get a vocational teacher to take one of these handicapped students. It is a real challenge.

So my thought is that, you know, these handicapped individuals are going to benefit the most from that participation. And that is a thought. And the Federal dollar that you are committing there is going to generate the State and local.

Chairman PERKINS. Let's just take the District of Columbia here as an illustration. Out here on these streets, we have thousands of black students who have dropped out of school in the ninth and tenth grade. If we increase these set-asides, we could be taking money away from those disadvantaged children who need training. Just let me boil it down to that. You are pretty hard to pin down.

Ms. RAZEGHI. Well, I don't represent the minority pop in this country by any means of the imagination. And that is not my job here today. But I think you don't have the representatives of the NAACP here.

I guess my general information on that and in some sense of perspective is that these advocacy organizations are a little bit turned of by vocational education. If you look at the OCR statistics, oh, in terms of including minorities, handicapped, and women—and I urge you to get that information. It is available. You will notice that it is a very small percentage.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr Goodling. Go ahead.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I suppose I should tell all of you something that you probably already know. When we tallied up all of the groups set-aside demands it came up to 110 percent of the State grant program. That is a little difficult to achieve. I haven't figured that out. I will have to go back and take some advanced math, I suppose, in order to come up with that.

There are two ways to look at what this bill would or would not do in relationship to the handicapped. At the present time, if you wanted to increase any amount for handicapped, you would have to increase the appropriation. It is the only feasible way.

Under the proposed legislation involving part E you possibly could help the handicapped without increasing the appropriation because Congress could determine that that's where they want the emphasis.

A second concern that the chairman just mentioned and I would agree with, is that how could you, since you are basically talking about handicapped in part E and not about disadvantaged, take care of the disadvantaged needs?

Dr. Bottoms, in the last 2 months, have you been getting closer to a consensus or further apart as far as all of the groups are concerned who seem to want to write this piece of legislation?

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman Goodling, we have recently had a meeting with those persons in voc-ed who are leaders in our organization who work with the handicapped and disadvantaged this past week. There are a number of technical amendments we will want to share with the committee that grew out of that meeting that would address some of the concerns they have raised. That at least for that group of leaders we worked out some of our differences there.

We have been meeting with the Council for Exceptional Children and some very fruitful meetings with Joe and his folks. I think you have heard some of the honest differences that still exist between that organization and the AVA this morning.

Mr. GOODLING. In all of this deliberation are you being realistic about funding? I have a difficult time believing that the Appropriations Committee is going to do much more than level fund.

In all of your deliberations are you being realistic about the problems facing us?

You might tell me that is not your responsibility.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman Goodling, I think we have taken serious—the testimony that has been given before this committee in the last 3 years—there are a number of studies that have been reported that about one-third of the secondary vocational graduates don't make it very well in the workplace, and don't progress upward very well. You only have to talk to a number of vocational teachers to find out why. They represent a lot of students we are talking about who today, that are in the programs today.

The issue in the field is not serving the youth and providing access. The issue is creating a legislative mechanism we can make a case to get adequate funding to get better results.

I have been trying to find out how much, for example, the handicapped money is actually spent in separate programs while 25 percent of the enrollment is there. I can't find the data nationally but I found it in one State yesterday that for those handicapped who enrolled in separate voc-ed programs where the Federal Government pays about 100 percent, the dollar amount expended is $350 per student. Those handicaps who are in mainstream programs it is $50 per student.

The problem we have in terms of extra services and efforts required for many of the youth, you just cannot do it on $50 or $100 or $150. Either we have to have a way to drive up our ability to make a case for increased appropriations or we have got to find some way that the dollars that Congress has already appropriated for handicapped and disadvantaged students can in fact follow those students once they enroll in vocational education.

That is an area we would certainly be willing to discuss with the handicapped community as to how that might occur—that the $220 already appropriated under Federal dollars for each handicapped could in fact begin to follow a handicapped student when they enroll in vocational education for those related services.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me ask Dr. Brody-Hasazi one question, and preface that by saying you apparently have a fairly good working relationship with Senator Stafford. I have heard some of his proposals that are going to come toward us and I believe you gave us a preview of those when you answered the last question.

My question to you would be that under present legislation, how much money is actually being spent on vocational education for the handicapped by local, State, and Federal agencies? And is that included in your chart that you had on page 6 of your testimony? I am talking about 94-142.

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. Yes.

Mr. GOODLING. Pardon?

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. It is included. For school year 1980-81, State and local allocations approximately $156 million.

Mr. GOODLING. Is any of that money from 94-142?

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. I really can't answer that. I don't think it is, no. The provision is that it is State and local dollars and I believe that use of those dollars—the Federal dollars—is prohibited.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you. I have no other questions.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have no questions.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ackerman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Bottoms, I think that the presentation you made as far as the structure is probably the most logical way to do this, but it would be under utopian conditions. It seems to me that in the short time I have been here there have been a tremendous amount of sharpshooters in Congress, that no matter what you put on the table as far as social programs, would look to whittle things down or pick things off.

I am trying to understand why you took the handicapped, cut them out of the main part of the bill, and put them aside where they would be most vulnerable should somebody choose to take a couple of potshots at this particular package.

It seems to me that if someone were trying to cut down the size of the dog it would be a lot easier for them to just chop off the tail. where you have put this, rather than just creating a smaller dog.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman, to respond to that question, we basically were trying to get, as I stated, two basic Federal roles. One that would focus on modernizing and improving and extending the program, and to drop the role to maintain programs.

Second, to get a strong Federal role in terms of serving the targeted population. If you noticed on page 76 of the bill, starting with line 21, we tried to very carefully say that the level of funding—and there are apt to be a couple of technical amendments because some language got dropped in drafting this—it was our intent there that the amount of dollars expended for handicapped and disadvantaged would equal the dollars currently being spent in 111 (a), (b), and section 140, which would come to over $211 million. Whether there is any money appropriated for E or not, the States would still have to spend that base.

We want an opportunity to make a case for increased dollars for this——

Mr. ACKERMAN. Are you talking basically about shifting the money for those programs, and then transfer it to the States, are you not?

Mr. BOTTOMS. No, no; it would come out of the other——

Mr. ACKERMAN. If we want to cut down on the dollars we are going to spend, we can do that because you can now make it a State responsibility.

Mr. BOTTOMS. No; the States would spend it for other Federal dollars appropriated. They would have to take off the top. If there is no money appropriated part E, at least $211 million to continue the level of current expenditures.

Mr. ACKERMAN. But that would give them less money to spend on other programs that we would be helping them to fund and you would in fact be making piranhas out of the various factions within different States and municipalities fighting to eat each other for the money.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressmen, that is no different than the set-asides you currently have. The only difference is it makes it possible for us to make a case for increased funding so we can get better quality results with these youth who do need extra services.

I think the dollar figures clearly show that the level of dollars driving for those extra services are not adequate to do the job well.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I think basically what you make it easier to do is just slice this program off and seek to have others fund it on different levels of government.

Mr. BOTTOMS. That is not our intent.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to both compliment and echo the chairman's remarks. We sit here—and I guess I become a little concerned as to whether we want to be idealists today or do we want to be realists. And if we have any interest in reauthorizing vocational education, I think we have to be a little bit of a financial realist as to exactly where we are going to go.

I am not convinced that you eliminate competition for funding over, one, should you say science or school of thought in vocational education over another area; whether you go with the set-aside, or whether you go with various parts A, B, C, and D. I mean, you are going to have competition either way—if is a percentage one way and really a percentage the other way.

I think we have got to ask ourselves, though, exactly what are our major goals in vocational education in the 1980's? And I must tell all of you that as I have met with every vocational school and every vocational director in my district—and I have four different schools, campuses, in my district. Every one of them responded by saying that if we could maintain funding at the present level, we would be happy, No. 1.

No. 2, if there are any new dollars—if we could use those dollars for high-tech equipment it would be absolutely essential.

Now, I sit here and I listen to the voc-ed emphasis on handicapped. I can't think of any better way to help the handicapped people in this society to get jobs and to train them to use the computers and the high-technology equipment we have got.

As I go through my schools in my area, whether you are talking about industrial technology in welding, in one campus, whether you are talking about meat science courses in another campus, whether you are talking about dairy science, you are talking about your traditional business and office courses, every one of those courses today use computers. I mean, it is absolutely amazing.

I know of no better way to meet the concerns in the postsecondary adult training, which I think is absolutely essential in a changing society, and to get at the concerns on the handicapped, than to provide the equipment, the updated equipment, which allows these students not only to get training once but, hopefully, to come back and get continuing education as they are in the private sector work force.

That sort of, I guess me, eliminates all the argument we have had for the last 2½ hours here and says that you cut it all out, and the only way to get something passed is to really stay fairly close to the status quo and put some additional money in areas that is going to match the concerns of every one of you.

Now, how do you react to that? Let's hear you.

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. I think your ideas are definitely legitimate. We have found in Vermont, which is obviously a small rural State,

that we do need to move to more increased technological offerings for our students.

But, on the other hand, we have also found that within our 16 vocational centers, which is all the centers for our State, that we just could never have enough resources to continue to update the equipment on site. The approach that we have used for our regular nonhandicapped students is to build closer linkages with industry and actually have greater involvement with cooperate education—meaning students would actually go onsite where this technology is being implemented throughout the State, and acquire the skills there in part, not just at the vocational center.

One of the problems with that for handicapped individuals is that over the years we have found that handicapped and disadvantaged participate far less in those on-the-job work experiences cooperative education, where the higher technology is really being learned, than the rest of the population in vocational education.

So, yes, I agree with you but I am not sure what the approach is to take because we haven't been very successful in ensuring that handicapped students receive those benefits.

Mr. GUNDERSON. So, you would not be opposed to us putting some kind of element in the reauthorization bill which is direct funding for high-tech equipment? A special type of need in terms of equipment to meet not only the special student but the general student.

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. I am not sure. I would want to assure that handicapped students were involved, definitely that some percentage would have direct—we could be guaranteed that handicapped students would have access to utlizing that equipment. I think that arrangements to purchase equipment that could involve business and industry in some kind of collaborative mechanism would be an appropriate way to do that.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD LOOMIS, STATE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. LOOMIS. I would like to just comment that I think three of the Congressmen have in different ways said the same thing, and that is if you are going to have strong programming for disadvantaged and handicapped you are going to have strong programming for all vocational education.

The areas in our State that we are getting hit with obviously are the high-tech occupations, but more importantly, the need for updating throughout our occupational areas with the high-tech that is coming right in within the regular fields.

It doesn't do any good to take an individual who is disadvantaged or handicapped and put them into a program that is either outdated with equipment, does not have up-to-date curriculum, or up-to-date instructional staff. So what we need to do, I think, is get beyond and look at the bigger picture which is a strong vocational education program overall and then let's take our money for the disadvantaged and the handicapped and see that they get the services within the programs.

Now, I would like to make one other statement. In our State we have put a strong push on mainstreaming both disadvantaged and handicapped. It probably would by 99⅘ percent mainstreaming.

I don't want to get into speculation but I will tell you what our local people are telling us. I have a letter on my desk to this effect from our special needs association. Basically what they are saying is that we were able to expand and to move to the disadvantaged and handicapped with large increases at times when State resources and local resources were available.

They are also telling me right now that because of the fiscal disaster that we have had in our State for the last few years, don't come and ask us to expand significantly our programming for the disadvantaged and handicapped which we need very badly, and ask us at the same time to maintain either the excess cost and/or the 50 percent match provision.

They are very concerned that they are not able to expand the programs at this point in time. We are getting very small expansion and we know, obviously, that it needs to be expanded much more.

So I would like to plead that the committee, I know, has some very difficult decisions to wrestle with, but you can't take set-aside on top of set-aside on top of set-aside and get up to 110 percent, as Mr. Goodling mentioned, and still serve the needs of business, industry, and the people in our State.

STATEMENT OF ROSEMARY KOLDE, GREAT OAKS JOINT VOCATIONAL DISTRICT, CINCINNATI, OH

Ms. KOLDE. Congressman Gunderson, I would like to respond from a local level. Mr. Loomis was responding from a State level.

Currently I have in my vocational district, 12 percent of my total enrollment are handicapped students. I have 84 percent of the identified handicapped students in our district in our school. So you can see that we are serving the handicapped. We had 420 students who graduated last year who were mainstreamed in vocational programs. There were 420. Ninety-six percent of those students who were seniors completed. So we are getting them out into the job market. We are securing placement for them and we are training them.

Now, it is costing our district to do that. We are putting in many local dollars to add the support to that. But that concern is not as large to us as the concern which you spoke about where we need to have new equipment; we have to change our curriculum; we have to serve the adult population which is ever increasing—the retraining and the training of adults that have been placed or are out of work replaced—the new technologies.

Also, we are finding that more with the adult population, that there are more who are going on to school continuously. It is a lifelong learning process.

Those are the types of things that we are concerned about and if we can provide those kinds of things for everyone, then the handicapped students benefit from that also.

So we certainly are doing our part in serving the handicapped and I am sure we have found it most rewarding and successful but

we need to upgrade and update also in order to be able to serve all populations so that there is an equal focus for everyone.

Mr. GUNDERSON. If I may, Mr. Chairman, one more question. I think that one of the things we have got to do, whatever we do, is we have got to eliminate this language which says you can no longer use Federal dollars to maintain existing programs in terms of updating that. This business of creating a new title for a program, you can buy that new computer with Federal dollars, is a joke. We all know that. I think we have got to deal with that question.

I really hope that this committee is the one that writes the vocational education reauthorization, not the floor of the House or the Appropriations Committee, or somebody else.

Looking at the financial realities that are facing us, we have really, if you look at the present statutes, a $1.5 billion authorization for voc-ed, we just never appropriate that much money at the present time.

So let's assume that we are not going to see a significant increase in appropriations. If we get on a deficit reduction movement in either 1984 or 1985, chances of big increases are not very good.

Under that atmosphere of a $850 million appropriation, would you people prefer present law or the bill which is now before us, assuming you have the same or present funding, because we have had some statements here that in order to make H.R. 4164 work we need $1.5 billion funding? I am not sure we can get that. So assuming that, where do we go?

No answers?

Mr. BOTTOMS. No.

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. Tough question.

Mr. LOMMIS. There is no question in my mind that if we are going to meet the needs in our State that we would like the proposed legislation. We believe that it was put together with a large amount of thought and discussion over time that is involved, at least in our State. We have had input into the bill by our local people who are working in this arena. We think it responds better to the needs of business and industry. It is less restrictive. It drives dollars into program improvement areas which we think is desirable.

There is no question in our mind, at least in our State, that we would prefer the draft as submitted.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH BALLARD, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Mr. BALLARD. I haven't said anything until now. I am Joe Ballard with the Council for Exceptional Children.

You raise the essential question, and that is that whether it is better for those of us that work on appropriations—as many of you there, too—is it better to have a number of separate line items where, in a sense, smaller populations for appropriations purposes are dangling by themselves and fighting to get what they can get, or is it better for us to be realistic about the future? And if being

realistic, to try to meet our objectives within one line item primarily and all be working together to achieve a respectable and good amount under that one line item.

Our argument from a very political standpoint, from the standpoint of the handicapped and the economically disadvantaged, is don't take us out of part A. We are an essential group, working to achieve whatever appropriation is achievable under part A. I would say that represents a number of interests here, too, which is there is really two schools of thought here regardless of the objectives represented in H.R. 4164. The objectives, fine.

The question is: What is the best way to do it from a realistic appropriations standpoint? We would say, if all of these objectives are acceptable to this committee—adult, industrial, whatever may be—it may be much more acceptable to put us all together in one line items so that we will all be fighting for the same thing, and enjoy whatever success or failure we will have, but do it together.

Does that make sense, Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank your, Mr. Chairman.

In my 20 years of lawmaking, I have been an advocate of vocational education and an advocate of the handicapped. It would be easier if you were all together on this issue. You present a difficult problem, of course, to this committee that we are going to have to resolve. I wish I could ask you all to step in a room and confer until you could return with an agreement. They used to do that in electing a Pope—not give you any food, until you come back with an agreeent. We won't do that to you. But we will have to address ourselves to that.

I think the gentleman at the end of the table, Mr. Ballard, summarized your argument the best way. There are cogent arguments on the other side, as well, but I think your statement summarizes the arguments from your position very, very well. I go back and forth myself, wondering how we can best serve special needs populations. Ultimately the appropriations process is going to determine how much money can be spent for vocational education. So I think that argument is a good summary of your position.

I am probably inclined to accept that argument, although I am still searching my own intellect and my own conscience for an answer. I invite the others at the table to try to respond well to that argument.

In H.R. 4164, you do have a hold harmless for the disadvantaged and handicapped. But I am often worried that in a hold harmless we tend to try to create a floor. What then, is to prevent that floor from becoming the ceiling? That is my worry, with any hold harmless clause.

Does anyone want to respond to that? Gene, do you want to try to respond?

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman Kildee, over the last 7 years our associations worked extremely hard in trying to drive up the appropriations for this field, and not very successfully. Arguments given by both administrations and by some members, is that the basic State grant is too broad; we don't know where the dollars are flow-

ing to; and the results stand alone. While other appropriations in other education areas have continued to grow substantially.

It seems that we have at least established a floor and made it possible for the Congress to target directly funds for those youth who are having transitional problems, and there are a number of them, as well as to adults. Where the Congress has had an opportunity in the past, in other legislations, to appropriate dollars to target special populations, I think the evidence stands very clearly that those appropriations have gone up.

We do not expect to get growth in the basic State grant. What we are trying to get in the basic State grant is a base dollar there that we can use to help keep the programs modernized, to improve, to retool, as the Congress said, some of the existing programs.

We have dropped from that to use Federal dollars to operate the basic programs. The State and local community will employ the basic teachers for the basic programs. Where they need help is when they have got a backup of folks who want into electronics—the jobs are there—and they can't expand. They need help to be able to expand that program.

So, if having it all in one box would have worked, it looked to me like while others were going up since 1976, we would have, too. So I guess what we are pleading is a different strategy. Basically we have been rather honest in trying to lay out and look at this, and we are pleased to work with you as you move through whatever course you take.

Mr. KILDEE. You know, that is part of the difficulty, because I can't think of any two groups for whom I have greater respect than the two groups, which often are in agreement, but today have a matter of difference.

In my 20 years, I worked closely with these two groups. I think if we were in a better fiscal climate then perhaps the struggle here might be less. But we are in a very, very difficult fiscal climate.

Right now the United States is clearly on the cutting edge of technological change. We are competing in a world production market. We are really part of a world economy now more than at any other time in our history. And even though there may be arguments between Liberals and Conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, as to what is the role of the Federal Government in education, clearly because we are on this cutting edge of technological change and are competing in a world economic market—this area of vocational education is undeniably a matter of Federal concern.

That is why I wish we had an expanding appropriation for vocational education, then perhaps some of these difficulties among those who are fighting for vocational education would be lessened. I understand that you are trying to maximize the dollar for everyone served, and there are going to be some differences because of the shrinking role, relatively speaking, of the Federal role in vocational education. This is a time we should be expanding it.

What I am trying to say is that this dismal fiscal picture for vocational education is perhaps exacerbating some of the differences between those who are being served.

Would anyone want to respond to that question of what would, though, keep the floor of expenditures from becoming the ceiling? I

mean, that happens in many, many areas. Does anyone have any other response to that? Dale?

Mr. PARNELL. I would just like to comment that we much prefer H.R. 4164 to current legislation, even with the current money. We think it makes a number of significant improvements that must be made, and lay some groundwork for whatever happens in the future.

I am kind of taking a long-range look at this as well as the short range. It may not provide the money that we need tomorrow but the next year. I just think that if we all continue to work on this, this gives us an awfully good foundation.

As far as our association is concerned, we wouldn't want to go on record as to doing anything but helping the programs for handicapped. I wouldn't want the committee to think that——

Mr. KILDEE. We know that.

Mr. PARNELL [continuing]. Nothing is going on out there. The State of California, for example, is investing large amounts of money in postsecondary through community colleges to work with the handicapped of all kinds, sensory handicapped as well as physical handicapped.

Mr. KILDEE. We know that. Your record is good. I think that is what creates problems for us, because we have two—well, several groups—here represented, whose credentials are unquestioned. There is honest and sincere disagreement. It is not like the nonhandicapped and the handicapped, because the vocational education people certainly recognize that part of their clientele, and a very important part of their clientele, is the handicapped. Your credentials are well established in that.

This may be the last hearing before we markup and have to address this very question.

STATEMENT OF GARY MEERS, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. MEERS. Congressman, I would like to add one thing to this. As the committee goes about its work, not to forget the disadvantaged. I come from that side. I work with both the handicapped and disadvantaged. And we have heard a lot about the handicapped movement today, and what are some possible alternatives. But please don't forget that disadvantaged sector. They are not being served as we would like to see them served.

And as you go to markup, keep them in mind. That is just a plea.

Mr. KILDEE. Yes. Thank you very much. I appreciate that, too. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Excuse me. Mr. Packard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. I am going to rotate here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Packard. Excuse me, Mr. Williams.

Mr. PACKARD. I would not mind, Mr. Chairman, yielding to Mr. Williams but, thank you.

I think that we have talked considerably on both sides of the aisle on the funding process. Obviously, if the provisions of the bill were ultimately made law where there would be $1½ billion funded, then you would be asking, in the handicapped area, for a 300-percent increase in your funding, which, I think would be totally unrealistic.

In other words, there would be a 100-percent increase or a doubling of the funding under that provision, but a tripling for the handicapped. I think that that, in and of itself, would need to be looked at very carefully.

But recognizing that funding will probably be very difficult to achieve, do you think that the chances of Congress appropriating additional funds for handicapped and disadvantaged students would be greater under the part E process or under the existing set-aside process, recognizing that the existing set-aside process would be tied to your basic State grant program, where to get 50 million additional dollars for your programs, you would have to ask Congress for a $500 million increase in the grants?

Or would it be easier for us to work with Congress on the basis of this being a separate program and ask for an additional $50 million for this particular program? Would our chances be better of getting that, assuming that all of us—and I have to assume that all of us on this committee—are anxious to get as much funding for handicapped and for disadvantaged students as is possible under the current economic problem?

Where do you think our chances would be greatest in getting the Congress to respond positively to an increase of funding in that area, which I think is a very desirable area?

Ms. BRODY-HASAZI. Joe.

Mr. BALLARD. Congressman, our feeling is startup appropriations, especially large startup appropriations have been a real difficulty with both Houses up here in the last few years. Part E is talking about serving a number of populations—by the way, unspecified, as to which amounts for what within part E, as currently proposed in the bill, to the tune of about 325 million to 350 million new dollars. That is not far below the prospect for mathematics and science if it were initially funded at well around the 400 level—and there has even been some scratching of heads about coming up with the real dollars for that initial funding. I have no doubt that Congress will. But is just shows how problematic it is.

I guess I have already said it and the Council would say again, we are firm believers that however you design it, that for political and appropriation purposes we have a much better chance being part of a larger whole; and working together with other constituencies to fight for the overall program. And, yes, realizing your percentage within that as a result of it rather than being a smaller program with limited prospects, especially at this time in history.

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you.

Dr. Parnell, do you favor that the breakdown of these dollars be on a percentage basis where there is a specific percentage for secondary and a specific percentage for postsecondary? And then among that breakdown, would you also suggest a specific percentage in occupational areas in, say, the postsecondary area?

Dr. PARNELL. We certainly favor a specific percentage as things now stand. We have not fared—since the money flows through State departments of education—we have not fared well in some States. And we think this is a floor. But in a State like your own in the State of California, that has been worked out at a 50–50 split between secondary and postsecondary by the actors that make those decisions. But in some States—and I think it is something close to 15 States—the community technical and junior colleges even get less than the 15 percent set-aside called for now.

We think even in the statistical recordkeeping that there should be separation of the statistics from the degree-granting postsecondary institutions as opposed to the nondegree granting. So I would have to answer yes; under the current consideration we think the floor is absolutely essential.

Mr. PACKARD. When you establish set-asides and targeting and categorical moneys, to what extent do you believe that that removes local and State options and flexibility in the management of the funds to target them at the local level where it would be most effective, recognizing a difference in different parts of the country, or different States, as it relates to the use of those funds?

Dr. PARNELL. It entirely depends on what State decisionmakers are making the decisions about how to allocate the funds. In answer to the question, if it is a sole State agency as it reads in this, then I think the 30 percent for postsecondary is essential.

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you. One last question.

If you remove the matching and the excess cost provisions, does this eliminate the necessary safeguards that we would have to have in order to ensure State and local fiscal support and participation?

Dr. PARNELL. I don't believe so. Actually, I think there is one Federal dollar for eight local dollars that go into that. I hate to see the Federal dollars drive the local dollars and telling them what to do, but I am going to ask Gene Bottoms to comment on it. He studied that deeper than I have.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Based on what we have proposed in terms of the excess cost, we want to place emphasis on mainstreaming students into the regular programs. Basically the full costs of the regular program is picked up by the State and local. The incentives would be on the Federal dollars picking up the cost of those extra services. But if they serve the targeted population youth in separate programs, they would be matching those. It is a reverse of the current situation.

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Like my colleagues, I, too, appreciate the informative testimony here today. I have found the past half hour or so to be particularly interesting, beginning, Mr. Chairman, with your pointed admonition about the limited amount of money that is available, followed by, I guess, agreement of that with each member of the committee. Mr. Gunderson spoke of the reality that was necessary in your perception of what is going to happen. And Mr. Packard has talked about the difficulty of achieving additional funding. It is my understanding that your

legislation calls for about a billion and a half—$1.5 billion in funding.

There are, of course, certain realities that you are all very cognizant of, with which we all have to deal. But there is something, I think, that ought not escape anyone in this room, and that is the public money is there to be spent in any way that the public decides through its elected representatives. And in the judgment, of many of us, public spending is misdirected and has been for several years.

We are in the first of 2 days of hearings on this issue. During those 2 days of hearings, the Pentagon will have spent all of the money which you are requesting for the coming year and $400 million to boot. Now, some of us believe that this Nation's spending compass is misdirected. And you should be here asking for every single dime you need to do your work and not a penny less. So I commend you for asking for $1½ billion, which, in fact, may not be enough.

The problem, of course, is that we have a stagnant economy because of 3 years of the worst recession in 50 years. We have an enormous deficit, unlike any other. In fact, we have now—I am a member of the Budget Committee too—and we now have a budget that tells us that in one term this administration will have stacked up more deficits than all of the deficits from George Washington to Jimmy Carter combined. And that affects what we can spend on your programs. That directly affects what we can spend on it.

In other words, there is sort of a frozen pool now of public money. We are witnessing for one of the first times in history of this committee—and I say that having only been on this committee for my sixth year, but I have watched the actions of this committee from afar and close up—and I think for one of the first times in history of this committee we are seeing people who have almost precisely the same interests going into divergent views because once the pie is frozen you have to fight for your piece. And if your piece is to get larger, somebody else's must get smaller.

So not only has this economy created enormous funding problems, but it has pitched Americans against Americans in a way that has not been happening in this country for half a century. That may be the great tragedy of Reaganomics.

There are a couple of questions now that go specifically to your programs, although in a rather general way. As I talk with businessmen and industrialists—some of them in my home State of Montana, but many of them here and other places around the country—and I asked them if there is any single skill which their workers need. They answer almost unanimously, well, they need the ability to think. We are concerned less, they tell me, with their training for the accomplishment of specific skills than we are the ability to think.

I happen to be a fan of vocational education, as some of you know, but some of my high school and college people tell me we are wasting money because they can teach folks to think. And businessmen tell me they can teach them the specific skills. So I am wondering about your response to that, whether this $1½ billion can't be spent in a better way on other educational pursuits.

Mr. Bottoms? Gene?

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman, we have tried to focus in the bill that there is a need to strengthen the academic foundations of the students in vocational and technical education. What we are trying to get at there—we know in the better programs across the country that where you can connect the teaching of the basic math, the basic scientific principles with the practices in an occupation, you get tremendous jumps in achievement.

We believe that what makes vocational education in America different from the European system, or the Far Eastern system, is that we do try to produce an individual who can begin to move into an entry job, but with the capacity to continue to learn and grow. So in some respects, vocational education is an alternative approach to education.

We believe that if those who propose to you that they do not need vocational education were to occur, that you would see a substantial rise in the dropout rates in this country, and you would have a substantial yell from the business community about folks not having a work orientation, familiarization of the tools, materials, and processes of the workplace.

So that would be my response to the question you posed.

Mr. PARNELL. I started my working life as an electrician and it brings me out of my chair whenever anybody tells me that the work I did did not train me to think just because I worked with my hands as well as my head.

There isn't any question that the good jobs of the future are going to require a better math base, a better science base, a better literacy base than we have ever required before. That is one of the reasons why in this bill we push high schools and colleges to work closer together. Why I am interested in a greater set-aside for post-secondary—that is our bag, is to help people relate the math, the science, the literacy of the systems approach of electronics, the systems approach to hydraulics, as it relates to a job.

We must provide broader vocational education rather than narrower. We should be opening the world up to people rather than closing it down for them. And I think this bill helps do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Loomis, in your State of Michigan, you have a tragically high unemployment rate and have had it for too long now. Do those unemployed people need to be taught a specific given skill through vocational education in order to change jobs or secure new employment?

Mr. LOOMIS. Let me respond, and I will quote the plant manager of Buick auto company and also the training director of Fisher Body. We have programmed with them this past year. And they find that to upgrade into the new technology or into other technologies, there is basically three things which are absolutely essential.

One is a thorough assessment program as to where they are, what their skills are, not only in the occupation they have had but for other occupational areas. Basic skills are absolutely essential, the reading and the math to go with it. They also need skilled training. And I might quote both of those people, who said on a video tape being interviewed by the press, that:

"We are in the business of building cars, not in education and training."

The Fisher Body training director is working very hard in working with the community colleges, the intermediate school districts, and the K–12 system to get basic skills for the people who are out there on the floor.

So I would say yes, they do very definitely, and they will say that they need training. They also need basic skills and they need the assessment component, which again makes this piece of legislation especially attractive that is being proposed, because all of those things can be done without many of the restrictions in the current legislation to help us really model and develop a program for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me we can say with some certainty now that Americans have come to a time when our professions, our jobs, change with an increasing velocity. And no longer will a person just be an electrician in his lifetime, he may have two or three other professions as well. You may not just be a teacher—several of us are proof of that here. You get other jobs as you go along.

Does this legislation reflect those changes? Does this legislation capture the job mobility, the changing velocity of differing professions?

Mr. PARNELL. It certainly makes a good start.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How does it do it?

Mr. PARNELL. The adult title, certainly that is the first time you have had an adult title. The high-tech title, that is the first you have had, particularly on a participating basis with employers. The out-of-school title addresses that particular area.

Yes, I think it makes a good run at it.

Mr. BOTTOMS. The State planning process and the local planning process does focus on the State and locals having to set goals in terms of the labor market requirements and to actually show the progress they plan to make over 3 years in modernizing and shifting programs to reflect the changing job demand as well as the changing content and requirements of jobs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me just encourage our friends in the vocational education community, the handicapped and disadvantaged communities, that they have an enormous stake in this year's budget process and in the well-being of the American economy. And that stake has never been, I think, focused more clearly than it is in your discussions and it is kind of a mini debate that we have seen here today.

What you are experiencing and we are sharing with you here today is a microcosm of the difficulty that people across America, who have the kinds of interest you do, even though in perhaps other matters, are faced with because of this economy and this deficit. And because our national spending compass is headed in the wrong direction, each of you have an enormous stake in this, and each of the people, be they adults, children, handicapped, disadvantaged, women, that you are trying to serve, have an absolute direct, enormous stake in it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Gus, do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. HAWKINS. With respect to the linkage between this program and other training programs such as, to mention one specifically, the Job Training Partnership Act, some of the purposes contained in this proposal parallel those in the Job Training Partnership Act—and I am wondering, what is the linkage between them or are we duplicating some of the programs that are already in existence?

Mr. PARNELL. I think I can start that answer by saying we are aiming at a different population. The Job Training Partnership Act is aiming at a segment of the population, basically unemployed, basically adult. The Vocational Education Act is aiming, really, at what I would call middle America—the middle quartiles of adults as well as youth, which is really quite a different problem.

I would say the purpose of the Vocational Education Act is to keep America working. The purpose of the JTPA is to put America back to work, at least those Americans that need that kind of skill.

There is provision in this act which encourages, in fact, requires, the State JTPA Coordinating Council to review the vocational education plan. That is the first time in this requirement. I think there are other requirements in the act that really require cooperation between the two.

Mr. BOTTOMS. Congressman, there are a number of provisions that do connect the two together, particularly in terms of coordination and consultation with part E and part F, trying to get us some compatibility in the data and information systems. There are linkages between the councils at the national, State, and local level. And particularly calls for the State describing how it will work the JTPA in the State planning process.

In the written testimony we will have identified for you those provisions that deal with coordination with JTPA.

Mr. HAWKINS. The Job Training Partnership Act does require training. Will that mean that they will set up a training program that is separate from, let us say, vocational education of community colleges?

Mr. PARNELL. We would hope that they wouldn't. But certainly the Job Training Partnership Act, the way it is structured, that is the prerogative of local pick to utilize any resource in the community they can use.

We are working hard to try to see that they utilize fully the community colleges and the vocational education centers in their training. But they is a local choice.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Any further questions from any member?

Let me thank the entire panel today. We are delighted that you all were here. I think this hearing has been very helpful, a very useful hearing.

We will adjourn the committee until Thursday.

[Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1983

Part II

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1984

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:06 p.m., in room 2175, Rayburn Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Hayes, Goodling, Roukema, Gunderson, Bartlett, and Nielson.

Chairman PERKINS. The subcommittee will come to order. We will have other members here in a few moments. This afternoon we are going to conclude the hearings on H.R. 4164, the Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983. Last year we held four hearings on this bill, which is the result of extensive work by the American Vocational Education, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and the National Association for State Directors of Vocational Education.

These hearings have helped us to understand the major issues in vocational education reauthorization and provided a forum for recommendations to improve the existing law or this bill. The subcommittee has scheduled a markup session for this bill on February 22. It is our hope to improve the Vocational Education Act this year and one of our concluding witnesses will be the State superintendent of public instruction from my own State, Kentucky, Mrs. Alice McDonald.

You come around, Mrs. McDonald. I think I know a little something about your financial problems insofar as education is concerned in Kentucky. I know we tried to be of assistance in certain areas last year but we met with tremendous resistance and did not get anywhere in our efforts to put you level with where you were in 1980 before we experienced the cutbacks.

But we did not make any progress. I tried again last week in conference with the Senate and we were unable to make any progress. So we have some very hard sledding from here in Washington this year—from the standpoint of improving—putting some additional funds into some of our Federal education programs.

35-667 O - 84 - 5

Let me tell you that I admire what's going on in Frankfurt at the present time. It takes a good deal of courage and leadership, in view of the fact that you have got to have increased revenue down there to do what needs to be done. I don't think any of us wants to see Kentucky near the bottom of the ladder insofar as education is concerned.

Other States are concentrating on high technology industries, and it's going to be a tremendous handicap down there if we don't go forward and do just what you are doing from the standpoint of industrial development in the future. I have seen so much of this since I have been here in the Congress.

But I am thankful that we have good leadership in Frankfurt and I look forward to hearing your statement today. You are not limited to vocational education—if you want to talk about the elementary, secondary, or student assistance programs or any other piece of legislation that we are involved in, feel free. I would like to see the Federal Government become a better partner and I am sure that that will happen one of these days. We have always considered education the primary responsibility of the States and in view of that situation we want to be as helpful as possible.

This is Mr. Goodling from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. It's good to have you here, and I certainly hope you take good care of eastern Kentucky.

Chairman PERKINS. Go right ahead, Mrs. McDonald.

[Prepared statement of Alice McDonald follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ALICE MCDONALD, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

It is indeed an honor for me, as a new chief state school officer, to be given the privilege to address this congressional committee, the setting from which great leadership for educational legislation has and is taking place. Mr. Chairman, I feel especially honored to be able to make a few comments about vocational education when addressing the man recognized nationwide as "Mr. Vo Ed." Kentucky is indeed proud of your brave leadership on behalf of education program legislation.

As the Congress continues to consider and begins to debate the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act, let me express strong support for House Resolution 4164 as the model upon which the new law should be built. The distinguished list of Congressmen and women who joined in sponsoring this bill, and the broad representation of education professionals who have banded together to draft and adopt its various provisions should signal very clearly that this is a proposed piece of legislation possessing historical significance. It has already been historically significant in the degree to which different and diverse segments of vocational education have been able to cooperate, compromise, and compile a bill which each can endorse.

There are several provisions of this new bill to which I would like to call attention.

The first point we are particularly pleased with is the call to make vocational education a full partner in the economic climate of this nation. The specific provisions to address the changing training needs of business and industry bespeaks an educational program eager to work with the nation's employers.

Increased services to the adult population is also a critical need and a welcome priority of this new bill. The increase to a minimum of 30% to expend for postsecondary students, whether in degree granting community college programs, or diploma awarding vocational technical school programs is an important step. However, in Kentucky we are already using more than 30% for adult students.

Targeting of adults needing retraining and upgrade skill training programs for workers in hard to fill jobs are high priorities in the minds of Kentucky employers. In a survey of 12[illegible] Kentucky employers conducted in October of 198[illegible] short term retraining and upgrade classes came out as the most needed type of training. Using federal funds as a force to stimulate increases in such programming is an excellent provision.

It is also a wise and important provision of the bill to stimulate through federal funds expansion and improvement of programs as a major purpose. Historically, federal funds have provided the initiative to cause the expenditure of state and local funds to achieve desirable results. There is no doubt in my mind that Kentucky would not have expanded its vocational education to serve 334,010 students last school year if the Vocational Education Act had not existed. This level of service resulted in commitments to building programs, curriculum development, teacher education and a myriad of other services. Certainly, the progress which has been made in serving disadvantaged and handicapped students, as well as opportunities for women in non-traditional occupations are directly attributable to the federal funding initiatives of the current law. We would like to ask for caution, however, in prohibiting the use of federal funds for maintaining existing programs. Under the current law we are able to add funds to existing programs for providing those services, activities, and equipment which local educational agencies cannot afford, but add immensely to the quality of the vocational program. I am speaking of such things as travel funds to make co-op possible, funds to make offering of adult short term classes possible, and funds to supplement the high costs of state of the art equipment. In addition, in our state operated schools, during these times of severely restricted state revenue, if we had not been able to put federal funding into existing programs, we would simply not be able to offer a great many programs which are providing much needed training. I am suggesting the proposed new law emphasize and prioritize the offering of new programs and services, and ask that it not totally prohibit the use of the funding for existing programs.

Another provision that we like very much in H.R. 4164 is the elimination of the local maintenance of effort requirement. Circumstances beyond anyone's foreseeable control have impacted small school districts. Mr. Perkins, under the current law such districts as Pikeville, Robertson County, and Hazard in your home territory have been faced with the unthinkable prospect of being denied federal funding because their local funding capability had declined over a two year period. We applaud keeping statewide maintenance of effort, but eliminating it at the local level.

There are two other areas of the bill which we see as a mixed blessing. The first of these is the planning requirement. Generally, this section is a fine improvement over the current law's requirements. We especially like the timing of the State Plan preparation and the latitude in content. The use of a revamped State Advisory Council as the state's planning body is desirable. We do feel, however, that asking local education agencies to prepare comprehensive three year plans and annual use reports is unrealistic. Certainly the state, our vocational regions, and even Jefferson County and Fayette County public school systems have the size, staff, and resources to make such a planning requirement useful. But to expect the rest of Kentucky's one hundred and eighty local school districts to do such planning will be indeed a burden and will result in useless paperwork. We would like to see reconsideration of parts of this requirement.

Another provision which we agree with in principle is the section on requiring business and industry partnerships. It is an excellent concept, and the requirements are all good except one, requiring that 50% of the non-federal costs come from business and industry. Why not simply require a contribution from the private sector and let the states have the latitude to negotiate the level of the private sector contribution in each case.

Finally, I would like to support the change for special populations program funding. I am fully aware of the pressures against this section of the proposed law, but making these funds a separate part of the Act will make administrating them so much easier. It is my belief that when a program is easier to administer, it is easier to have full utilization of the funds. I believe special needs students will benefit from the way this provision is written.

Let me conclude by offering my congratulations of a bill that promises to be a dynamic force for beneficial change in vocational education during the next several years. I encourage your colleagues in both Houses of Congress and educators everywhere to get behing this piece of legislation.

STATEMENT OF ALICE McDONALD, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mrs. McDONALD. It is very good to be hear and I will take good care of eastern Kentucky. I hope eastern Kentucky takes very good care of me. I think that is the question.

It's indeed an honor for me to be here, as a new chief State school officer, to be given the privilege to address this committee, the setting from which great leadership for educational legislation has and is taking place. Congressman Perkins commended the leadership that is now taking place for education in Kentucky. I would like to say that perhaps we look here and we look to him and we see that it does take courage and dedication to get the job done and I think that is what you are seeing demonstrated today in Kentucky.

Governor Collins has certainly taken a bold stand on the side of education and is aggressively lobbying for educational needs and is going after new tax incentives in order to meet those needs.

I commend her for looking at other areas and for pledging almost all or somewhere above 70 percent of the new dollars to education in Kentucky. I think, together, as we look to the future, that we can, in fact, make a difference in Kentucky in education and we can do it through educational reform.

Some of the reforms will take new dollars and some will not, but we must move on. I feel especially honored to be able to make a few comments about vocational education, particularly since I am sitting in front of the man who at least we in Kentucky and I think the whole Nation feels is "Mr. Vocational Education," and that is Congressman Perkins. So I am delighted to share my thoughts on that subject.

The country has responded to "A Nation At Risk." In Kentucky, as in every State in the Union, educators are beginning to work together to focus their resources on achieving excellence in the classroom. More science and mathematics, additional requirements for graduation, and greater emphasis on writing and speaking skills are resulting. It started with national leadership and it has certainly now gone to State leadership.

I have not, however, heard very much discussion of how "A Nation At Risk" applies to vocational education. It seems to me that the situations enumerated by that report and by others apply to vocational education as well as to general academics. Too many of our students are graduating from high school, not only without the academic skills they need to hold a job, but without the employability skills they need. They may have been taught something about how to use the machinery required in the occupation that they choose to pursue, but the level of their skills, their ability to reason, to interpret instructions, to work as a member of a team on an assembly line, even to get to work on time, leave much to be desired.

A national concern with productivity in the workplace zeroes in on tardiness, absenteeism, and low expectations for workers. The workplace is demanding excellence. Can we afford to do less in the classroom, in the vocational education classroom?

I once read that of all the dollars spent on education in the United States by all sources, one-third of it was spent by industry training its employees to do their jobs or to do them better. This is astounding to me. It's also an indication that vocational education must take to heart the findings enumerated in "A Nation At Risk." I believe that there is a call to excellence that must be

heard by all students—elementary, secondary, and vocational. Our vocational students must be prepared for employment.

We, in Kentucky, have some economic difficulties. Technology is moving so fast that it is going off and leaving us. By the time we have geared up and think we have achieved a state-of-the-art situation in vocational education, we find that technology has jumped ahead and we are still standing at the starting gate. We are not alone in this situation; other States face it every day.

There simply is a lagtime between the creation of a new job or a new occupation and the development of the training for that occupation in our vocational schools.

The chairman of our State advisory council for vocational education, Dr. Stanley Wall, made an astute observation in his report just a couple of weeks ago to the State board. He said that, "We should train our people for high-tech jobs, not for high-tech industry, because, in Kentucky's case at least, more businesses and industries need individuals with high-tech skills than there are specific high-tech industries in which they find employment."

Quite simply, to me, he was saying that high tech so pervades our economy that you do not have to be Silicon Valley to be involved in it. The repair of cars and washing machines, the operation of heavy equipment, the taking of x rays, the installation and even the use of a computerized recordkeeping system require high-tech skills. The economy is not just in the process of changing, the change has come and vocational education must change to meet it.

It concerns me that, while we train many people in vocational education, not all of them are employed. There are a variety of reasons for this failure. You can work to reduce the gap, but the gap somehow always seems to continue.

I guess I want to talk about a particular program in Kentucky now. It's a small program, funded through our economic development efforts, to train workers for new and expanding industries. The industries designate the workers to be trained. They call upon the department of education for its services in developing and administering a training program tailored directly to that industry's needs. The Department will write the curriculum, give the training, do the testing and the followup.

The employment rate for this training program is nearly 100 percent. The average cost to the State of training an individual is returned fivefold the first year to the employed workers' productivity and tax payments. It seems to me that this approach has some national implications for vocational education. It begins with the specific needs of the business or industry. The training is done at the industrial site using the company's equipment and following the company's requirements to the letter. It is specific training for a specific purpose, with a specific goal and a specific job in mind. It achieves that coordination between business and education that vocational educators have long desired and worked to obtain. It is not a scattered shot situation and because it is not it has been extremely productive.

If done on a much larger scale, it would significantly reduce the numbers of public dollars we would need to spend on vocational education. You wouldn't have to worry about whether the skills you are teaching are up-to-date, because you would be using the in-

dustry's newest techniques and equipment, utilizing the highest state of the art without having to buy it at public expense.

Industry can write off its training-related expenses while the worker, through increased productivity and participation in the economy, contributes more to the public welfare. The results in workers and industry satisfaction have been excellent. While we in Kentucky have used it specifically for new and expanding industries, it is applicable to every situation in which new technology requires the retraining of workers.

I wanted to point out a particular program in Kentucky because I think, although it is small, it is one of our best and it is one that couples business and industry and education in a very fine fashion. But I am here today to specifically point out some concerns in the Vocational Education Act.

Let me express strong support for House Resolution 4164 as the model upon which the new law should be built. The distinguished list of Congressmen and women who joined in sponsoring this bill and the broad representation of education professionals who have banded together to draft and adopt its various provisions should signal very clearly that this is a proposed piece of legislation possessing historical significance.

It has already been historically significant in the degree to which different and diverse segments of vocational education have been able to cooperate, compromise, and compile a bill which each can endorse.

There are several provisions of this new bill to which I would like to call attention. The first we are particularly pleased with is the call to make vocational education a full partner in the economic climate of this Nation. The specific provisions to address the changing training needs of business and industry bespeaks an educational program eager to work with the Nation's employers.

Increased services to the adult population is also a critical need and a welcome priority of this new bill. The increase to a minimum of 30 percent to expend for postsecondary students, whether in degree-granting community college programs or diploma-awarding vocational-technical school programs, is an important step.

In Kentucky, we are already using more than 30 percent for adult students so it is extremely important to us. Targeting of adults needing retraining and upgrade skill training programs for workers in hard-to-fill jobs are high priorities in the minds of Kentucky employers.

In a survey of 1,200 Kentucky employers conducted in October 1983, short-term retraining and upgrade classes came out as the most needed type of training. Using Federal funds as a force to stimulate increases in such programming is an excellent provision.

It is also a wise and important provision of the bill to stimulate Federal funds expansion and improvement of programs as a major purpose. Historically, Federal funds have provided the initiative to cause the expenditure of State and local funds to achieve desirable results. There is no doubt in my mind that Kentucky would not have expanded its vocational education to serve 334,000 students last school year if the Vocational Education Act had not existed.

This level of service resulted in commitments to building programs, curriculum development, teacher education, and many

other services. Certainly, the progress which has been made in serving disadvantaged and handicapped students, as well as opportunities for women in nontraditional occupations, are directly attributable to the Federal funding initiatives of the current law.

We would like to ask for caution, however, in prohibiting the use of Federal funds for maintaining existing programs. Under the current law we are able——

Mr. GOODLING. Could you excuse me just a moment? The chairman was going to come back and I understand I have only 2 minutes to get there to vote. If you will just suspend for a few minutes, I think he will be coming in and I believe that Mr. Nielson is coming around the corner.

Mrs. MCDONALD. OK.

Mr. GOODLING. Excuse me.

[Brief recess.]

Mr. NIELSON. Superintendent McDonald, would you continue, please?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Thank you.

I was discussing some concerns with the bill and one of the concerns and one of the things that we would like for you to look at with some caution is prohibiting the use of Federal funds for maintaining existing programs. Under the current law, we are able to add funds to existing programs for providing those services, activities, and equipment which local educational agencies cannot afford, but add immensely to the quality of the vocational education program. I am speaking of such things as travel funds to make co-op possible, funds to make offerings of adult short-term classes possible and funds to supplement the high costs of state-of-the-art equipment.

In addition, in our State-operated schools, during these times of severely restricted State revenues, if we had not been able to put Federal funding into existing programs, we would simply not be able to offer a great many programs which are providing much needed training. I think that will be more critical in the next 2 years. As I look at the budget proposed by the Governor of Kentucky, I see a great deal of money for vocational education not there, and when asked, it is said that it is being put on the back burner for certain programs to be looked at, to be overhauled, to be reworked and for equipment to bring us into the high tech world that we need to be in.

But at the same time we have students now, we have students next year and the following year who need to be trained and perhaps we do need to look at what we are doing and regroup, but we need to go on with the program now. We would simply not be able to offer a great many programs which we are providing at this time without the Federal funds.

I am suggesting that the proposed new law emphasize and prioritize the offering of new programs and services, but ask that it not totally prohibit the use of funding for existing programs.

Another provision that we like very much in H.R. 4164 is the elimination of the local maintenance of effort requirement. Circumstances beyond anyone's foreseeable control have impacted small school districts. Mr. Perkins, under the current law, such districts as Pikeville, Robertson County, and Hazard in your home territory

have been faced with the unthinkable prospect of being denied Federal funding because their local funding capability has declined over a 2-year period.

We applaud keeping statewide maintenance of effort, but eliminating it at the local level. There are two other areas of the bill which we see as a mixed blessing. The first of these is the planning requirement. Generally, this section is a fine improvement over the current law's requirement. We especially like the timing of the State plan preparation and the latitude and content. The use of a revamped State advisory council as the State's planning body is desirable.

We do feel, however, that asking local education agencies to prepare comprehensive 3-year plans and annual use reports is unrealistic. Certainly, the State, our vocational regions, and even Jefferson County and Fayette County public school systems and maybe a few others of the size, staff, and resources to make such a planning requirement useful. But to expect the rest of Kentucky's 180 local school districts to do such planning will be, indeed, a burden and will result in useless paperwork.

We would like to see reconsideration of parts of this requirement.

Another provision which we agree with in principle is the section on requiring business and industry partnerships. It is an excellent concept and the requirements are all good except, in our opinion, one—requiring that 50 percent of the non-Federal costs come from business and industry. Why not simply require a contribution from the private sector and let the States have the latitude to negotiate the level of the private sector contribution in each case?

Finally, I would like to support the change for special-populations program funding. I am fully aware of the pressures against this section of the proposed law, but making these funds a separate part of the act will make administering them so much easier. It is my belief that when a program is easier to administer, it is easier to have full utilization of the funds.

I believe special needs students will benefit from the way this provision is written.

I would like to offer my congratulations on a bill that promises to be a dynamic force for beneficial change in vocational education during the next several years. I realize that it is sometimes difficult to move ahead when people are sometimes cautioning you not to.

I have a favorite story. I don't know if it's an eastern Kentucky story, but it certainly is a Kentucky story. I always hear everybody saying, "Let's get our ducks all in a row before we move ahead." Now it's been my experience with ducks, at least ducks in Kentucky, that it takes one duck to swim on out front and maybe a few ducks out front and all of the ducks seem to line up behind them.

So I commend Congressman Perkins and the sponsors of this proposal and I believe that it is the way to move in vocational education. I encourage you and your colleagues in both Houses of Congress and educators everywhere to get behind this piece of legislation.

I thank you for the time and I would be happy to talk about anything else or answer any questions. It has been told in Kentucky

that I can give you 2 minutes, 2 hours, 2 days, or 2 years on education. I would be happy to do that, but I think you have other things to do and I have pointed out our specific concerns in this case.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling will be back in a minute. Before I left a few minutes ago to run over and vote he made it very clear to me that we were not suffering from any gender gap in Kentucky. We have a lady governor and a lady superintendant of public instruction. I told him it was working out real well.

Mrs. McDonald, the bill before us calls for funding of $1.5 billion for vocational education. The Federal Government now spends about $738 million for this act. I would like to ask you if you need additional funds for vocational education in Kentucky.

Mrs. MCDONALD. The answer to that would be, quite simply, yes. And as I pointed out in the testimony, we need them now. But the next 2 years of the biennium they become even more critical. And if you look at the budget that is being considered now by the legislature, and I'm sure it will be their budget when all is said and done, but many of the proposals coming out of the executive branch treat vocational education at a continuation level, and in some cases it does not provide, under the school building authority, for any new buildings of schools, if they are vocational education schools. They must be local schools, elementary and secondary schools, and not State vocational schools.

There are many areas. The staffing of two new vocational schools is being done at a very meager level, in our opinion, to get the job done. And so as we look at the next two years in vocational education in Kentucky, we will need to look to other areas in order to do the job.

Chairman PERKINS. We all want to eliminate as much paperwork in education as possible. Do you think that we should eliminate the local planning requirement in the bill, to cut down on the paperwork?

Mrs. MCDONALD. I would agree with that, most definitely.

Chairman PERKINS. Now, Kentucky, like many other States, is in the process of increasing the academic requirements for graduating from high school. I have heard some vocational educators express concern that eventually increased academic requirements might squeeze time for vocational courses out of the school day.

Do you have any comment on that concern, and more broadly, what do you think the role of vocational education ought to be in today's schools?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Well, I think you have to have the right mix. And I think we, in Kentucky, do have the right mix. That is true that we did require two more academics in Kentucky last year. But at the same time, we raised the number of credits that you needed to graduate. So, the same flexibility is there. We have a new English and a new math requirement, but you also need 20 credits to graduate and not 18. So, your flexibility is exactly the same. Your ability to choose vocational education courses at the high school level has not diminished at all.

And again, I guess I'd like to go back through a few things I said at the very beginning of the testimony, and that is I believe that we need to teach our vocational education students the very basics

or the essential skills they need for vocational education and on-the-job also, and this will take time in academic subjects, in order to achieve this. So, I think it's a very delicate mix, and it must constantly be looked at and you cannot rob one for the other.

But at the same time, the vocational education class must have a student who can read, write, and compute just as the literature class or the creative writing class must have that type of student.

I talk to business and industry all the time and I had several people from a particular labor union say to me, "Yes, we need good electricians, and you send me a student who has mastered algebra II and I'll show you a good electrician."

So, at the same time these students are in vocational education classes, they must be in the very necessary core curriculum classes if they have the ability to achieve, and in Kentucky we are trying to take a look and keep a focus on that delicate balance, and that is why we raised the requirements to 20 credits, to give students the same flexibility as they had in the past.

Chairman PERKINS. Now, I noticed in your testimony that you cautioned against prohibiting using Federal funds to maintain present programs. Could you expand on that?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Yes. It is critical in this time, when money seems to be a problem at all levels, and I happen to agree that there is a great role in education, in all education, and in vocational education, for the Federal Government and for Federal dollars.

But when money is so very critical at the State level, it would be impossible for us to continue on some of our programs if we did not have this flexibility, if we could not continue on some of our essential ongoing programs with Federal funds. So, it would simply mean that those programs could not be offered, and we would like to have that flexibility.

Chairman PERKINS. Assuming that we limited the new funds, I mean the Federal, to new programs, would poor school districts be harmed, in your judgment?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Yes. The rich would get richer and the poor would get poorer. That's always the way.

The wealthiest school districts would continue to have their money in essential ongoing programs, and then they would be available to take the money for new programs, and the poorer districts could not maintain the programs that they have.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. I'd like to followup on that, Mr. Chairman, because I think your fears should be allayed in section 202 of this particular bill, because in section 202, under one, it says, "New, improved, expanded or intensified vocational education programs that are responsive to labor market demands," and then in four of that same section it says, "Strengthening the institutional base of vocational education by modernizing curricula, providing up-to-date instructional equipment and materials, improving local and state planning, updating the skills of the instructional and guidance staff, and similar means."

I believe, as I interpret the bill, that you would be protected in that section.

Mrs. MCDONALD. We have looked at that and we have looked at the word "intensified," I guess, but we have some concerns, and I

guess that's what I was pointing out. But if you interpret in that way, it certainly would be helpful.

Mr. GOODLING. That's the way I would interpret it.

Mrs. MCDONALD. But it would be critical that we would be able to use some of the money in the programs that—existing programs.

Mr. GOODLING. I think basically all we're saying is no matter how small the amount of funds may be, there is something you may be able to do to improve the existing program, and I believe you're covered in section 202.

I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. Superintendant McDonald, I didn't hear your entire testimony but I have a couple of questions.

How do you feel about the lack of a set-aside for handicapped? We had testimony just the other day indicating that was quite a problem.

Mrs. MCDONALD. Well we, even among my own staff, have two opinions on that. But we certainly—we have some staff members who certainly think that there should be a set-aside. But I think we come down on the side that we think that this bill, pulling it out and having it stand there, is the way to go.

Mr. NIELSON. The same question about the disadvantaged, the 20 percent. Do you think that should be in the bill or not?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Well, I would say that it should be in the bill.

Mr. NIELSON. It should be in the bill?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Yes.

Mr. NIELSON. It's not now in the bill, but it should be in?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Would you explain your question again? Perhaps I didn't understand it.

Mr. NIELSON. I asked about a 20-percent set-aside for disadvantaged, as we now have. Would you approve of keeping that in?

Mrs. MCDONALD. OK, I'm sorry. I did not understand what you were saying. No.

Mr. NIELSON. You prefer that to be sort of block granted as far as you're concerned?

Mrs. MCDONALD. I'm afraid I'm not understanding your question and I guess that's why I can't answer it.

Mr. NIELSON. I'm putting words in your mouth. Maybe it's too easy.

Mrs. MCDONALD. Yes, I'm afraid you are. And so I——

Mr. NIELSON. You're suggesting on the one hand that you want the flexibility and you want, therefore, to have these set-asides that are in the current law eliminated so that you can handle them directly?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Correct. I am saying that we have—we certainly have two opinions but we can live with the way it is in the bill.

Mr. NIELSON. We've been criticized, on the minority side of the House, several times for the block grant that was put in in 1981, because they say, "You put these in the block grant and some of these pieces didn't—desegregation and others—did not get taken care of," and therefore they come back and ask for additional moneys to do those special parts.

Are we running the danger of, if we don't set these aside, of the minorities and the disadvantaged coming back and the handi-

capped coming back and saying they were in the bill but they were fooled with in such a way that, "We didn't get our share and we, therefore, have to have additional money for them." Is that a danger, do you think?

Mrs. McDONALD. I would think that we would handle the flexibility in Kentucky——

Mr. NIELSON. Yes, in Kentucky. But what about all the States? Would they?

Mrs. McDONALD. I'm not so sure I can speak for all the States. I think I'll just limit my knowledge of what I can speak for to Kentucky. But in Kentucky I think that we would handle that and handle it properly.

Mr. NIELSON. What about the economic development skilled work force training? Do you think there should be some funds set aside for that? You mentioned that.

Mrs. McDONALD. Well, it's hard for me to elaborate too much on that. But as we move ahead in Kentucky, again, you know, we have some State programs that handle some of that for us, I'm not so sure I could give you a definite answer one way or the other at this point.

Mr. NIELSON. OK, another question. Do you believe that this bill is too broad, has too many definitions for vocational education, too many things come under the umbrella? We've had a number of witnesses testify that it's broadened too much and therefore may neglect some of the traditional vocational education areas. Do you concur with that or do you disagree with that?

Mrs. McDONALD. No, I am comfortable with the bill.

Mr. NIELSON. We also had people saying we should have more than one agency, possibly, in a State receiving vocational funds, one for possibly post secondary and one for elementary, secondary, and vocational. Do you agree with that or not?

Mrs. McDONALD. No, I do not agree with that.

Mr. NIELSON. Do you also feel that, as some people who have been to see us on this, about the lack of vocational help in the post-secondary education institutions, the technical colleges and even the community colleges, do you feel that they have, in any way, been sleighted in the past?

Mrs. McDONALD. The community colleges?

Mr. NIELSON. Yes.

Mrs. McDONALD. Well, again, I can only speak to Kentucky's interest and I would say that we have a good partnership and we have an excellent post secondary vocational education system, which serves the needs of Kentuckians. So, you know, in Kentucky it would not apply.

Mr. NIELSON. One last question. You object to the 50-50 basis matching funds from business and industry. Would that not show a real partnership and a real help if you had a 50 percent, or do you think it would be done with 10 percent, or do you think each State should make its own decision?

Mrs. McDONALD. I'm not so sure that I object to the 50-50; I'd just like to have flexibility so that in some instances it would not have to be 50 percent. I can understand where you're trying to set some standard, but I would think it would be very helpful to us if we had the flexibility to make it less in some instances.

Mr. NIELSON. What if State A says "Five percent help is sufficient from private enterprise," and the other State says, "Ninety percent is required"? Don't you think we should guarantee some help from the private sector in order to get the proper training, proper vocational programs?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Well, I think flexibility and if you're using the program correctly, would be very helpful to the overall program. Holding that at 50 percent, I think, would cut down on flexibility and make it more difficult. I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. NIELSON. Mr. Chairman, I guess the only problem I have is I've heard ever since I joined this committee, criticism about the whole idea of block grants, and basically this bill is a block grant. It doesn't set-aside for minorities; it doesn't set-aside for handicapped; it doesn't set-aside for economic development. And the only place it does specify a number is the 50–50. And that is the only place you're objecting to the bill.

It seems to me like we can't have it both ways. If we give you the flexibility, we're going to have to expect you to perform, and have your States perform. And it seems to me like you want the flexibility but you don't want to do your share on the State level. Am I unfair in that statement?

Mrs. MCDONALD. I wouldn't agree with that statement, but I don't know if it's unfair. I think, certainly, the first ingredient for making any sort of program work is accountability and performance, and I guess I'm looking for both of those things coming from Kentucky, with leadership from the Kentucky Department of Education.

At the same time, I've always been a proponent and can understand why some things need to be legislated or mandated. But certainly good performance and accountability on the part of those administering the program makes for a good program, and I think perhaps in this bill we have the right mix. But if that statement differs from yours, then it does.

Mr. NIELSON. I really shouldn't be picking on you, superintendant. You've given very good testimony.

Mrs. MCDONALD. I am quite accustomed to being picked on. I've just been superintendant a month and I've had my share. I come to you from Senate A–R hearings locally, State level, so I've had a full 2 days of being picked on.

Mr. NIELSON. I'm just saying that as soon as we pass a bill with block granting, for flexibility, and by the way, I was in the State legislature and I was for block grants there too, if some State does not mix it up just right, we have a complaint because we don't have enough for minorities, we don't have enough for handicapped, we don't have enough for economic parts of the bill. And then they come back for more and say that was never in the bill, you didn't set it aside, and they ask for more money. That's the way all these bills balloon and we get out of sorts as far as our financial situation is concerned.

And I just want to be sure that this bill, if passed, has some flexibility for the States, but also has some definite earmarkings so we don't get criticized by the same kind of criticism we've had all this year on the block grant programs we have had in the past. That's where I'm coming from.

Thank you.

Mrs. McDONALD. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and superintendant, thank you for your testimony. I happen to find a lot in there to identify with. It's like someone heard my statements of 2 days ago at this hearing and they went out and found a witness who agreed with me, because I made the statement about the maintenance of effort. It's a real problem and both our chairman and the ranking member have discussed that more than I have. I just want you to know that you've got a lot of friends on this committee who agree with you that we've imposed a mandate that forces schools, frankly, to lie by making some small change or by changing the title of a program so they can get the continued funding.

The one thing I'd like to raise that I don't think others have dealt with much, is more from a reality sense, than anything else. If I have a concern about the bill and I have a concern about the progress of these hearings on this bill thus far, it's that we're probably creating a false sense of hope out there as to what, in essence, we're going to end up with.

I have no problem, personally, with a $1.5 billion authorization for voc-ed. That's what we have at the present time. But somehow as I sit through the hearings, I had the impression from our witnesses that we're going to end up with a $1.5 billion appropriation as well as authorization. Now, anyone who thinks we're going to be able to double the appropriation in the fiscal arena in which we're dealing right now, I think they're extreme optimists.

I would be interested in hearing your perspective, out in the States and target on your contact with your other colleagues. I know you'd like the money. I understand that and I know you can put it to good use. But really, if we reauthorized the program and came down with an appropriation level fairly close to the present figure—in other words, maintenance of effort—how would that affect Kentucky? Could you live with that?

Mrs. McDONALD. Well, without answering that directly, let me say that I don't have any problem with having expectations, and with identifying needs, and with talking about them. And I understand there is sometimes a difference between what you talk about, but if you don't identify the needs and say that these are the needs, and this amount of money would, in fact, solve the needs, they are not out there at all.

And sometimes you do receive, in fact, the money or almost the amount of money that you do to meet those needs.

If, in fact, we do not in this case, I am sure, to answer your question with that small "promo," we can live with whatever comes—we have in the past—but you would have to define what living with it meant and that would be, in many cases, not providing the education that Kentucky students need or meeting the needs of today's demands in the job market.

So, yes, we can live with it and we will, but certainly we have identified needs and put a funding level that would solve those needs and I would like to speak with a clear voice that it would be very helpful in Kentucky.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, just very quickly. One last question and I pursued this, again, the other day. What if we maintained the present level of funding and any new funding we provided was aimed mainly at providing special assistance for equipment, high tech equipment, to teach vocational education? Would that be a priority area or not?

Mrs. MCDONALD. You are pulling out one need, but you are leaving a lot of other needs unmet. Again, whatever this committee decides on, I am sure that we will live with. But you would be meeting one need and not meeting others. If that's where you decide the priority is, then that's where it is.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you, Mrs. McDonald, going back to the question that Mr. Nielson referred to, that is, your concerns about the bill's requirement that business must match any new Federal funding for high technology programs. Would Kentucky businesses be able to make this match; would the coal companies be able to donate funds for these programs, or would we be shifting funds to the more affluent areas? That's the thing that came to my mind. Do you care to comment on it any further?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Well, I would say that the 50-percent match, in many cases, could be met, but we, in Kentucky, would like the flexibility when it could not. I guess that is the simple statement I was trying to make, that we do have industry in Kentucky that could, in fact, meet the match at that level, but that we have others that could not and so I would just hope that we could have some flexibility there, some latitude to negotiate with the private sector and that's what I was asking for.

But, in some cases, we think it would be a hardship and in other cases we think it would not. In fact, in some cases, they would be able to participate even at a higher level and we would have to have the latitude or the flexibility.

Chairman PERKINS. My position, in general, is that we should give the States more money and more flexibility. Do you think this bill gives you both? As far as the funding, you know that the figure in the bill is just an authorization; it's not an appropriation. But you do think it gives you the flexibility that you need?

Mrs. MCDONALD. Yes, it does. That's the shortest answer you will ever get from me.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. I just want to thank you for some very excellent testimony and for the manner 9in which you handled yourself in responding to the questions.

We do have a problem. There are those in the Congress who would like to make an issue of the fact that our priorities are out of order and I would agree with that. But, unfortunately, some of those who are making such statements at the present time locked us into cement in 1981 when David Stockman told us, "If you do this in defense, then you are committing yourselves to $30 billion a year increase through 1985."

So some who are yelling the loudest at the present time also locked us in at that particular time and therefore it makes it very difficult with the deficit that we are faced with. I am hoping, of course, that this bipartisan group, in spite of the election that is

coming up in the fall, will have the courage to perhaps increase funds. We reduced taxation to stimulate the economy and I think it worked.

Now if we are going to keep it going, maybe we have to increase funds and we might have to have a couple of combinations but we should have the courage to do it even though it's an election year and I hope that we can do it.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. McDONALD. I can send some Kentucky ducks up here if it will help. You have one, but I will send some others, if it gives you any courage.

I look forward to sharing with you at a future time some other aspects of Kentucky's vocational education. I am here today alone without my associate superintendent for vocational education, Wibbie Pratt and my deputy, Audrey Carr. I am sure that they could have given testimony that would have been even more in-depth on this subject. But since we are a new administration, we are very busy with a lot of project startups so we felt that I should come alone, but we will be here together in the future to share with you.

Mr. GOODLING. You can be sure that you will get that opportunity because the chairman will lead us down into Kentucky, if not this year, certainly next year.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank you very much, Superintendent McDonald. You have given the committee excellent testimony. We all appreciate your appearance here today, and you have been very helpful to the committee. Thank you very much.

Mrs. McDONALD. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. A few weeks ago I was in my office at Ashland, KY, and I had two gentlemen come in there. One was the Democratic County Chairman of Carter County, KY, and the other one was the Republican County Chairman of Grayson, KY, and they both had suggestions——

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, could I ask you to rephrase that? It's a Democrat chairman. Whenever they say "Democratic" that just raises the cackles on my neck because they are not "Democratic," they are "Democrat." [Laughter.]

Chairman PERKINS. You are right.

I'll let you guess which chairman came, but they both offered suggestions to me at the time. I asked both of them to come up here and one has shown up. Come around, Dr. Worthington—excuse me, Mr. Jack Bailey of Grayson, KY. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOODLING. That's all right, Mr. Chairman. They are both Republicans so it really doesn't matter. [Laughter.]

Chairman PERKINS. We're glad to welcome you here, Mr. Bailey. Go ahead.

[Prepared statement of Jack H. Bailey follows.]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JACK H. BAILEY

POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM IN KENTUCKY

To: The U.S. Congressional Subcommittee on Education.
From: Jack H. Bailey, P.O. Box 636, Grayson, Kentucky 41143.

The following is a list of items in order of importance compiled from educators from three counties in my vicinity; being Carter, Greenup, and Boyd counties.

(1) Laws for spanking, and stronger discipline in school.

(2) Teacher evaluation and upgrading to a minimum national standard.

(3) Student testing by a nationally standardized test through-out their twelve years, and before graduating from High School.

(4) More Federal Monies for Elementary and Secondary Education for Class-room expansion, class-room and Lab. Equipment, and Teacher pay.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO KENTUCKY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

To: The Congressional Subcommittee on Vocational Education.

From: Jack H. Bailey, P.O. Box 636, Grayson, Kentucky 41143.

The following is compiled from Educators in the Tri Counties of Carter, Boyd and Greenup; also directly involved was the Advisory committees at the Ashland State Vocational School located in Ashland, Kentucky.

This committee was selected from a cross section of industrial and commercial employees and supervisors.

(1) More Federal monies for teachers, updated equipment and training.

(2) Upgrading of the vocational training curriculum to include the High Tech field of Laser Fiber optics, Robotics and Micro Wave; the vocational training system is falling behind at a very fast pace.

(3) Monies for Auto mechanics and a curriculum to cover the Hi-Tec ignition and control of the late model autos.

(4) Funding for out-ot-state Training and support for teachers when proper training is not present in the State.

(5) Returning to the first, second and third class Radio Telephone license as it once was.

The change recently made to general class license has degraded the position, the testing to acquire the license is much to easy, and the license can no longer be used as a yard stick in evaluating an prospective employee by an employer.

(6) Restore the class D citizen band radio license, increase the fee to $100.00 per five year period, raise the power allowed to 25 watts input, and have the respective State Police of the individual states police and enforce the licenses, and power, use the net monies generated by the new licenses for education.

STATEMENT OF JACK H. BAILEY, GRAYSON, KY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, honorable committee members, Superintendant McDonald, I'm very pleased to have been invited by Congressman Perkins to testify before the Congressional Subcommittee on Vocational Education. We, in the Ashland State Vocational Area have an advisory committee. That's the reason I'm here. I'm serving on it.

We've met and thrashed out some ideas on possibly improving our system on vocational education. I have the minutes of one such meeting here. I'm going to turn it over to the committee. But we've itemized a few things here I'd like to read to you. It won't take up too much of your time.

Suggested improvements to Kentucky vocational schools. The followirg is compiled from educators in the tricounties from Carter, Boyd, and Grant Counties. Also directly involved was the advisory committee at the Ashland State Vocational School, located in Ashland, KY. This committee was selected from a cross section of industrial and commercial employees and supervisors, and the No. 1—these are in order, here, of priority—more Federal moneys for teachers, updated equipment, and training, was one of the priorities. And I think Mrs. McDonald responded on that quite well, our needs.

No. 2 was the upgrading of the vocational training curriculum to include the high-tech field of laser, fiber optics, robotics, and micro-

wave. We're behind in these areas. High tech's come on so fast in the last few years. We're getting further behind.

Three is moneys for automechanics and curriculum to cover the high-tech ignition and control of the late model automobiles. They're building these cars now nobody can work on them. They're even having problems with the factory technicians coming out. I've heard stories that people coming from the factory, they can't fix an ignition or a computer control on an automobile. So, we need moneys in the vocational areas for that.

I discussed some training or lack of training for the vocational teachers in the high tech area, and in the Ashland area some of them have gone as far as Texas to pay their own way in order to upgrade themselves on high technology that's passing them.

I believe that we should have funds for out-of-State training and support for teachers when proper training is not present in the State.

The five is getting into a little different area, but it's really related to education, that the Federal Communications Commission licensing of radiotelephone operators. Just in recent years they've done away with the third, second, and first class radio operating license, which was sort of a yardstick nationwide for employers hiring technicians. They could tell about where you were in the technical field by what license you held.

In recent years they've done away with the third, second, and first class radiotelephone license and they've got a general class, which tells you hardly anything when you take off in the job field with a general class license. For one reason, on a third class test you had, the best I remember, is 75 questions on the third class radio operator's test. The second class contained 100. The first class contained 100.

The general class that replaces all 3 of those and tells you very little, only has 100 total. So, in our opinion, the change recently made to the general class license has degraded the position. The testing to acquire the license is much too easy and the license can no longer be used as a yardstick in evaluating a prospective employee by an employer. I think they should go back to the old system, or else separate the general class to the other three classes, put the three classes of FCC license back in.

This was the yardstick in electronics nationwide.

A sixth one here is we hashed this over, also, pertaining to radio. The class B citizens' band radio license is no longer required. There's truckdrivers and automobiles going down the highways operating on the marine band at this time with high power. They're operating 250 or 1,000 watts. It's been turned loose by the FCC. They don't require a license from the Federal Communications Commission to operate a citizens' band radio at this time.

Our idea was to restore the class B citizens' band radio license, increase the fee to $100 for a 5-year period, raise the power to allow 25 watts input, and have the respective State police of the individual States police and enforce the license in cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission, enforce the license and power.

And the last part of it is the part we like, use the net moneys generated by the new licenses for education. We've turned this

thing out to—it's getting out of hand. It's giving the people the idea they can operate a radio on any power or any frequency they want to.

Another thing, radio stations have—are no longer required to have a station engineer. I think that is bad. It's getting out of hand. It's another area where radios are getting out of hand. They should have at least a second class radio operator technician at each radio station, in our opinion.

That's all I have directly on vocational education. I do have a little thing here on possible improvements to our school system in Kentucky. I went over the three counties and interviewed educators as well as individuals, and took notes, and I got four things in order here that came out of averaging these answers to these questions I asked. The following is a list of items in order of importance, compiled from educators from three counties in my vicinity, being Carter, Grant, and Boyd Counties.

The No. 1 thing to improve the schools complied, in the eyes of the educators, was laws for spanking and stronger discipline in school. And that's the old country language I guess, but that's what it gets down to. If you don't have discipline in school, you don't have a school. So, we need discipline back in the schools but we need the laws to enable the educators to implement discipline.

No. 2 in priority was teacher evaluation and upgrading to a minimum national standard. There should be a national standard. I've heard stories where people graduated from high school in Kentucky and went to another State to enter college and couldn't pass the entrance exam. I'd like to see this changed, if it hasn't already.

Three was student testing by a nationally standardized test throughout the 12 years of high school, and before graduating from high school. And if it's a nationally standardized test, this ain't going to happen. If you go to another State to enter college, you should be able to pass the entrance exam, if it's standardized nationally.

Four was more Federal moneys for elementary and secondary education for classroom expansion, classroom lab and equipment, and teacher pay. We know teachers, in my opinion, do more for their money and their energy expended than just about anything else in the country. So, that's all I have, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask a question, Mr. Bailey.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. Your testimony for vocational education about the cause for increased funding, we face large deficits at the Federal level, which you know, and do you think this increased funding for vocational education will pay itself back over the years in higher taxes to the Treasury, through training people for better jobs?

Mr. BAILEY. I certainly do, sir. The higher level people you put out of these vocational schools, the more money they're going to make and the more taxes they'll pay, in my opinion. And if they go out there and ditch dig and market, they're going to be paying very few taxes. If they are trained properly, they are going to go into higher tech, higher pay, higher paid jobs, and in my opinion they will more than pay back the taxes.

Chairman PERKINS. Have you experienced the needs that you have suggested to the committee through your occupation and making a living?

Mr. BAILEY. I worked at it, it used to be Armco Steel Corp. It's Armco Inc. now. They've since diversified. But 29 years in electronics, as an electronics tech, I've seen vocational school graduates hire in and I've worked right along with them and I've had people hire in from other trade schools, and in my opinion the vocational school graduates are far superior to the normal trade schools, especially in our Ashland area. They are really superb graduates in the Ashland Area State Vocational School.

I work with them every day. And their training is real good, above average, the vocational school.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's always nice to have someone testify before us who doesn't come from the ivory towers. We have an awful lot of those. Sometimes I don't understand what they're saying. It's also nice to have someone testify before us who doesn't have one specific interest and only one goal in mind, because we get them before us all the time.

I'm happy to see that you are interested in the whole issue of standards. In many instances in your testimony, it seems that those are things you will take to Mrs. McDonald, because they are basically a State responsibility. I guess the one place where we would really have a difference of opinion would probably be in student testing by a nationally standardized test. I understand what you're driving at. I have great fears about that because there are also those who call for a national curriculum, and I think that would be the most devastating thing that could happen, and the two might tie together.

I can understand each State putting together tests that somehow would complement each other. I can understand a national assessment kind of thing. But I would be worried about some standardized test, and worst of all, it may be developed here in Washington, DC. That would be totally devastating. And then, as I said, the second concern I would have would be the national curriculum.

But I do thank you very much for your testimony and for coming up to join us.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me congratulate you. When you came in my office there that day, you and your friend, both in the opposite political camps, it kind of amused me when I invited you both. I didn't think either one of you would show.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that right?

Chairman PERKINS. And I was completely surprised this morning when you did come in my office. Let me thank you for all your trouble, and we hope you will come back again some of these days and give your testimony to the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. BAILEY. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Our next witness is Dr. Worthington. Come around now, Doctor.

Mr. GOODLING. Dr. Worthington, the chairman has to leave for a few minutes. He always wants me to take his chair, but until I can

take that chair through my party having the majority in the House, I'd prefer to sit on this one. I have a feeling I may be sitting on this one for a long time. But nevertheless, would you please go ahead.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Goodling. I wanted to tell Mr. Perkins that I feel right at home with all the Kentuckians, having gone to school at Dry Ridge High School in Kentucky, in a little country town not too far from his district, and having graduated from Eastern Kentucky State College. I wanted him to know I was also a Kentuckian today.

Mr. GOODLING. He'll have you repeat that when he gets back, because I think that will really help you tremendously.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Robert M. Worthington follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to be here to testify in support of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act, introduced by Representatives Erlenborn, Bartlett, Nielson, and Packard. This bill is the Administration proposal for reauthorization of Federal vocational education programs and it has four principal objectives:

(1) to consolidate the existing vocational education State grant programs into a single, simplified program of grants to States;

(2) to reduce administrative burden and increase State and local flexibility over the use of funds;

(3) to redirect Federal support to concentrate on vocational programs that will contribute to economic development; and

(4) to assist the States in ensuring handicapped and disadvantaged students equal access to vocational programs.

This bill is structured along the same lines as the vocational and adult education consolidation proposal put forward by the Administration last year, although we have made few changes which respond to concerns raised a year ago in the House and Senate hearings. The most important of these changes is that we are no longer seeking to include adult education in the legislation. This bill would consolidate only vocational education programs, and, in order to give greater prominence to adult education programs as part of the National Adult Literacy Initiative, we are proposing separate legislation to reauthorize and simplify the Adult Education Act.

The bill also differs last year's proposal in the following respects:

Each State would be required to use at least 10 percent of the funds it receives under the Act, not including funds going for State administration, to meet the special needs of the handicapped and at least 20 percent to meet the special needs of the disadvantaged. This represents slightly more than the current share of Federal funding devoted to each group.

The State allocation includes a "hold-harmless" provision, which would be phased out over a three-year period, in order to moderate the impact of improving targeting in the formula.

We believe that these new provisions will ensure that the special-needs populations receive an appropriate level of services and will ease the transition into a new State allocation formula.

A NATION AT RISK

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Vocational Education Consolidation Act responds to the recommendations of A Nation at Risk, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and that its enactment would be a milestone in our campaign to improve the quality of education across America. As you know, the Commission recommended that all students in our secondary schools receive a firm grounding in the "five new basics" (English, mathmatics, science, social studies, and computer science), that we raise our expectations for student performance (as expressed through the use of textbooks, tests, and college entrance requirements), that we make more effective use of the school day and, if necessary, extend the school day or school year, and that we take steps to improve teaching. These recommendations have provided a basis for our efforts in the Department of Education to strive for educational excellence.

How does vocational education fit into these efforts? Our belief is that vocational education must participate as a full partner in the national campaign for excellence, for the quality of our vocational classrooms will be as important to America's future as the quality of our academic classrooms. Students who enter to labor market immediately after high school, in addition, to those who go straight on to college, must be proficient in the five new basics or they will not be able to compete successfully in today's job market. Our bill is careful to authorize instruction in basic skills, as an integral part of vocational preparation, for students who require it. Vocational educators, like all educators, must be trained to provide high-quality instruction and should be rewarded on the basis of their success in this task. And vocational students must be educated and then certified to employers on the basis of rigorous, realistic standards, or else their training will not have been worthwhile.

A second major report, Education for Tomorrow's Jobs, by the National Academy of Science, stresses the importance of making the vocational education system an equal partner with college preparatory education in the educational system as a whole. We wholeheartely endorse this recommendation and believe that our proposal, with its strong emphasis on program improvement, would make a major contribution toward realizing this goal.

Although the States and localities must continue to lead in implementing measures to improve vocational education, the Federal government should provide assistance to the States in ensuring that our country's vocational students the best instruction possible, and that they are trained for occupations that will contribute to local, State, and national economic development. The Federal role also includes assisting the States to ensure that handicapped and educationally disadvantaged students can participate in vocational education along with the rest of the population. These are the principles embodied in our legislation.

STRUCTURE OF THE BILL

I would like to describe, briefly, the structure of our proposal. Part A, General Provisions, is a simplification of parallel provisions of the current Vocational Education Act (VEA). At least 95 percent of all funds appropriated would be made available for State programs; the Secretary would be authorized to set aside up to 5 percent for discretionary projects in areas of national interest. The VEA formula for State allocations (based on population and inverse per capita income) would be better targeted on areas and groups in need of service by including an unemployment factor, targeting more heavily on older populations and eliminating constraints on the income variable. In order to participate in the program, each State would have to file an annual Proposed Use Report, which would replace all of the State plans, reports, and evaluations required under existing law. The report would include a simple explanation of proposed objectives, activities to be carried out, and allocations of funds, as well as other basic assurances and descriptions.

Part B of the bill would authorize State programs. A single, consolidated grant would replace the six existing categorical programs as well as the set-asides for postsecondary and adult programs and for guidance and counseling. Program matching, maintenance-of-effort, and other fiscal requirements would also be eliminated. However, as I noted above, each State would be required to use at least 10 percent of the State grant for services for the handicapped and at least 20 percent for services for the educationally disadvantaged. At our fiscal year 1985 request level (which would continue the fiscal year 1984 level), these set-asides would lead to a slightly higher Federal funding level for the two special-need populations than will occur under current law in 1984.

Under Subpart 1 of Part B, States would be required to use at least 30 percent of their grants for programs and projects specifically related to economic development. From these funds the States would support such activities as training needed for new businesses entering their areas, development of training programs in new occupational fields, retraining of skilled workers who have lost their jobs because of technological or economic changes, and entrepreneurship training for men and women who want to start their own businesses. Encouragement is offered for these locally designed programs to be coordinated or jointly administered with business and industry, and with training and employment programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, so that the training provided is truly related to local skilled workforce needs.

Subpart 2 of Part B would require the States to use at least 30 percent of their funds for strengthening State and local systems of vocational education. This subpart would support such activities as cooperative education, work-study programs, remedial instruction in basic skills, support services, programs to reduce sex stero-

typing and sex bias in vocational education, and consumer and homemaking education.

Part C of the bill would authorize national discretionary programs in vocational educations. Allowable activities under this part would include research (including support of a National Center for Research in Vocational Education), programs for Indian tribes and Indian organizations, the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and other program improvement activities designed to meet national skilled workforce needs. Such activities could include the development and demonstration of model sex equity programs, development of collaborative vocational education programs that combine the resources of business, labor and education, personnel development programs, and programs to encourage the use of volunteers in vocational education.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, the Administration believes that the Vocational Education Consolidation Act would be vastly preferable to the current Vocational Education Act. The current law has been roundly criticized for trying to do too much, for having little overall theme or purpose, and for having too many set-asides and funding restrictions, and for imposing too many reporting and record-keeping requirements. There is clearly a need for simpler legislation containing a few understandable national goals and leaving greater administrative discretion to State and local policymakers. That is what our bill would accomplish.

I must almost state that we strongly prefer our bill to H.R. 4164, the Vocational Technical Education Act, which is cosponsored by several members of this committee. The Vocational Education Consolidation Act and H.R. 4164 embrace some common emphasis and themes, such as using vocational education as a tool in economic development, assisting States in ensuring equal opportunity for the handicapped and disadvantaged, and achieving greater coordination of vocational education with the private sector and with the Job Training Partnership Act. But, unfortunately, the authorization levels in H.R. 4164 are excessive and unrealistic. The bill contains even more spending set-asides and requirements than are in current law and, as such, would restrict to an unreasonable degree the authority of officials at all levels to operate programs suited to local, State, and national needs. Finally, the procedural requirements set forth in H.R. 4164 are overly complicated and would mandate a high and expensive level of administrative (rather than programmatic) activity. For these reasons, the Administration strongly objects to H.R. 4164, as currently written.

SUMMARY

In closing, I would like to thank this subcommittee for allowing me to explain our vocational education proposal, how it fits into the Administration's plan for improving the quality of education, and how it compares with other legislation. I believe that the Vocational Education Consolidation would lead to improved vocational education, would spur the States and localities to develop vocational programs that will assist economic development, and would meet the needs of the handicapped and disadvantaged, our most at-risk populations. It would also dramatically increase State and local flexibility over the use of funds and would reduce the record-keeping and reporting burdens. I strongly urge that this bill be enacted.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT WORTHINGTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am very pleased to be here today to testify in support of H.R. 4793, the administration's Vocational Education Consolidation Act introduced by Representatives Erlenborn, Bartlett, Nielson, Packard, and others just recently.

This bill is the administration's proposal for reauthorization of Federal vocational education. It has four principal objectives. The first is to consolidate the existing Vocational Education State Grant Programs into a simplified program of grants to the States.

The second is to reduce administrative burden and to increase State and local flexibility over these uses of funds. I was very pleased to hear the Superintendent of Public Instruction from Kentucky agreeing with us on that flexibility which, we think, our legislation exemplifies.

Third, to redirect Federal support to concentrate on vocational programs that will contribute to economic development, and fourth, to assist the States in ensuring handicapped and disadvantaged students equal access to vocational programs.

This bill is structured along the same lines as the Vocational and Adult Education Consolidation Act put forward by the administration last year. Although we have made a few major changes which respond to concerns raised a year ago in the House and Senate hearings.

The most important of these changes is that we are no longer seeking to include adult education in the legislation. This bill would consolidate only vocational education programs and in order to give greater prominence to adult education programs as part of the National Adult Education Literacy Initiative, we are proposing separate legislation to reauthorize and simplify the Adult Education Act.

The bill also differs from last year's proposal in the following respects: Each State would be required to use at least 10 percent of the funds it receives under the act, not including funds going for State administration, to meet the special needs of the handicapped and at least 20 percent to meet the special needs of the disadvantaged.

This represents slightly more than the current share of Federal funding devoted to each group. The State allocation formula includes a hold-harmless provision which would be phased out over a 3-year period. We believe that these new provisions will ensure that the special-needs populations receive an appropriate level of services and will ease the transition into a new State allocation formula.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Vocational Education Consolidation Act responds to the recommendations of "A Nation At Risk," the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and that its enactment would be a milestone in our campaign to improve the quality of education across America.

As you know, the Commission recommended that all students in our secondary schools receive a firm grounding in what we call the "new basics"—English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science—and that we raise our expectations for student performance, as expressed through the use of textbooks, tests, and college entrance requirements and that we make more effective use of the schoolday—extend the schoolday or the school year; that we take steps to improve teaching.

These recommendations have provided a basis for our efforts in the Department of Education to strive for educational excellence.

How does vocational education fit into these efforts? Our belief is that vocational education must participate as a full partner in the national campaign for excellence, for the quality of our vocational classrooms will be as important to America's future as the quality of our academic classrooms.

Students who enter the labor market immediately after high school, in addition to those who go straight on to college, must be proficient in the five new basics or they will not be able to compete successfully in today's job market. Our bill is careful to authorize instruction in basic skills as an integral part of vocational preparation for students who require it.

Vocational educators, like all educators, must be trained to provide high quality instruction and should be rewarded on the basis of their success in this task. Vocational students must be educated and then certificated to employers on the basis of rigorous, realistic standards or else their training will not have been worthwhile.

A second major report, "Education for Tomorrow's Jobs," done by the National Academy of Sciences with a national committee of scholars stresses the importance of making the vocational education system an equal partner with the college preparatory education system and education as a whole. We wholeheartedly endorse this recommendation and believe our proposal, with its strong emphasis on program improvement will make a major contribution toward realizing this effort.

Although the States and localities must take the lead in implementing measures to improve vocational education, the Federal Government should provide assistance to the States in ensuring that our country's vocational students receive the best instruction possible, that they are trained for occupations that will contribute to local, State, and national economic development. The Federal role also includes assisting the States to ensure that the handicapped and educationally disadvantaged students can participate in vocational education along with the rest of the population.

These are the principles embodied in our legislation. I would like to describe very briefly the structure of our proposal.

Part A, General Provisions, is a simplification of parallel provisions of the current Vocational Education Act. At least 95 percent of all funds appropriated would be made available for State programs; the Secretary would be authorized to set-aside up to 5 percent for discretionary projects in areas of national interest.

The Vocational Education Act formula for State allocations, based on population and inverse per capita income would be better targeted on areas and groups in need of service by including an unemployment factor, targeting more heavily on older populations and eliminating constraints on the income variable.

In order to participate in the program, each State would have to file an annual Proposed Use Report, which would replace all of the State plans, reports and evaluations required under the existing law. The report would include a simple explanation of proposed objectives, activities to be carried out and allocations of funds, as well as other basic assurances and descriptions.

Part B of the bill would authorize State programs. A single, consolidated grant would replace the six existing categorical programs as well as the set-asides for secondary and adult programs and for guidance and counseling. Program matching, maintenance-of-effort and other fiscal requirements would also be eliminated. However, as I noted above, each State would be required to use at least 10 percent of the State grant for services for the handicapped and at least 20 percent for services for the educationally disadvantaged.

Our fiscal year 1985 request level, which would continue the fiscal year 1984 level—as you know, Mr. Chairman, the President decided to request $238,400,000 more than he did last year for vocational education. This is the maximum allowable under the current law.

Under subpart 1 of part B, States would be required to use at least 30 percent of their grants for programs and projects specifically related to economic development. From these funds the States would support such activities as training needed for new businesses in their communities, development of training programs and new occupational fields, retraining of skilled workers who have lost their jobs because of technological or economic change and entrepreneurship training for men and women who want to start their own businesses.

Encouragement is offered for these locally designed programs and with training and employment programs under the Job Training Partnership Act so that the training provided is truly related to local skilled work force needs.

Subpart 2 of part B would require the States to use at least 30 percent of their funds for strengthening of local and State programs of vocational education. This subpart would support such activities as cooperative education, work study programs, remedial instruction in basic skills, support services, programs to reduce sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education, and consumer and homemaking education.

Part C of the bill would authorize national discretionary programs in vocational education. Allowable activities under this part would include research, including support of a National Center for Research in Vocational Education; programs for Indian tribes and Indian organizations, the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and other program improvement activities designed to meet skilled work force needs.

Such activities could include the development and demonstration of model sex equity programs, the development of collaborative vocational education programs combining resources of business, labor and education, personnel development programs, and programs to encourage the use of volunteers in vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, the administration believes that the Vocational Education Consolidation Act would be preferable to the current Vocational Education Act. I must say at this point that all of us who have worked in vocational education commend Chairman Perkins for his leadership in vocational education.

We believe, however, that the current legislation has become too prescriptive. It has been characterized as trying to do too much and for having too many set-asides and funding restrictions and for imposing too many reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

There is clearly a need for simpler legislation containing a few understandabie national goals and leaving greater discretion to State and local policymakers. That is what our bill would accomplish.

I must also state that we strongly prefer our bill to H.R. 4164, the Vocational-Technical Education Act, which is cosponsored by several members of this committee. The Vocational Education Consolidation Act and H.R. 4164 embrace some common emphases and

themes, such as using vocational education as a tool in economic development, assisting States and ensuring opportunity for the handicapped and disadvantaged and achieving greater coordination of vocational education with the private sector and with the Job Training Partnership Act.

But, unfortunately, the authorization level in H.R. 4164 is excessive and unrealistic. The bill contains even more spending set-asides and requirements than are in current law and, as such, would restrict to an unreasonable degree, the authority of officials at all levels to operate programs suited to local, State, and national needs.

Finally, the procedural requirements set forth in H.R. 4164 are overly complicated and would mandate a high and expensive level of administrative rather than programmatic activity. For these reasons, the administration strongly objects to H.R. 4164 as currently written.

In closing, I would thank the subcommittee for allowing me to explain our vocational education proposal, how it fits into the administration's plan for improving the quality of education and how it compares with other legislation. I believe that the Vocational Education Consolidation Act would lead to improved vocational education, would spur the States and localities to develop vocational programs that will assist economic development and would meet the needs of the handicapped and the disadvantaged, our most at-risk populations.

It will also dramatically increase State and local flexibility over the use of funds and would reduce the recordkeeping and reporting burdens. I strongly urge that this bill be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify and I would be most happy to respond to any questions you might have.

Mr. BARTLETT. Dr. Worthington, the chairman of the committee has moved a little bit further to the East since you have been testifying—or to the West, since I am from Texas.

I apologize on behalf of the members who couldn't be here during your entire testimony. There is a lot going on, as you might know, as it's the last day before the recess both on the floor and in other committees.

Let me begin by saying that Mr. Goodling, who is the ranking member, as you know, of this subcommittee and who has cosponsored the other bill, he wished for me to pass along to you his compliments for the administration's bill and the administration's proposal and believes that there is a good deal of value in the proposals that you make and is looking forward, as am I, to reviewing it. I did cosponsor the administration's bill and I think somewhere by using the best ideas of those and, frankly, some of the best ideas from the private sector and from school districts around this country, we will come out with a bill that will be of value to the students.

I have some specific questions, if you wouldn't mind and I would like to go through them. The first is on money. H.R. 4164—and I suppose the one issue that this committee and the Congress are going to have to get over so that we can then consider the other issues—H.R. 4164, as currently written, provides for $1.5 billion in funding, which is double the current appropriation and approxi-

mately double what the administration is proposing. I would like to elicit your testimony on taking that funding amount and maybe turning it over and looking at it on the other side.

In your judgment, what impact on other worthy Federal education programs would there be if we were to choose to double the funding for vocational education? Would there be a fallout or an impact on other Federal education programs?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Well, we feel, as I said in my testimony, that the authorization level is excessive and we certainly would object to any additional funding for education. In the first place, our deficits would be increased further and we are trying to avoid that, as you know—everyone is trying to. We object to it on the basis of it being excessive. We must keep in mind that vocational education is a program that is predominately funded at the State and local level. The most recent statistics which I have available indicate that during school year 1981-82 vocational education was funded using only 9.16 percent Federal dollars and 90.84 percent State and local dollars. We feel that the request we have made this year for funding is realistic, and will still provide the Federal leadership that is needed as far as research and development is concerned and will continue to serve as a catalyst for State and local action. We feel that what we have requested is adequate and we would object to the large authorization level in H.R. 4164.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I would suggest that it is perhaps particularly ironic in a vocational education bill where we are training students for skills to then enter the job market, that if we do that in a way that at least one of a number of Federal programs that would increase unemployment and reduce the available number of jobs in that job market by doubling Federal spending in that area, it would be particularly ironic and cruel to then have a training program that, by the size of the program itself, would reduce the number of jobs when the students graduate.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Bartlett, we should remember also that the reduction in inflation that has been due, in large part, to the President's program, makes these dollars go much farther.

Mr. BARTLETT. Dr. Worthington, I would like to visit with you just a second on adult training and particularly the training and retraining of displaced workers, whether they be structural unemployment or displacement because of new technologies, displaced homemakers, or for whatever reason. What emphasis does the administration's proposal place on retraining of displaced workers or adult training and how high a priority would you judge that should be?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. We consider that one of the high priorities for economic development. It is spelled out quite clearly in our bill that this is one of the high priorities. We would also like to report at this time based on the study of the National Alliance of Business, that some 90 percent of respondents in a survey of private industry councils—as you know, the Job Partnership Act has a $223 million allotment for title III with a $111 million State match for July 1984-June 1985 for retraining of workers---this survey indicates that most of this retraining will be done by the existing vocational and technical education delivery system—our community

colleges, our technical institutes, and our area vocational technical schools.

So vocational education will be very actively involved in this and we feel that our bill responds to this very, very important national priority.

Mr. BARTLETT. Shifting over to the special needs populations, H.R. 4164 accommodates those special populations, the handicapped and disadvantaged with a separately authorized program. The administration's bill, and frankly, my own viewpoint, and the current legislation accommodate the special populations with set-asides as opposed to a separate authorization. Can you comment on why you would urge us, for example, to use the set-aside approach and how you personally came up with the 10-percent figure? Why wasn't it 15 percent?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. You may recall that our proposal last year had a 10-percent set-aside for the handicapped funded against only one part of the legislation. Members of the House and the Senate spoke with us about that and also many of the organizations representing the handicapped and disabled persons. Under the present act which requires the 10-percent set-aside, we are presently serving 39.5 percent of the secondary aged students who are handicapped and we recognize that we must try to serve more. This Federal allocation has encouraged the State and local communities to serve the handicapped.

Our proposal would require that 10 percent of the funds available to the States be spent for handicapped individuals. This is after the Secretary's 5 percent for national discretionary programs and the State administrative costs are taken off. This would, according to our calculations, raise the funding of vocational education for the handicapped, if it were enacted as we have proposed for 1985 by 8.3 percent above the current level. There would be 8.3 percent more dollars available for the handicapped and we would like to increase that number so that ultimately we would be able to offer vocational education to all handicapped students at the secondary level. Some may not be able to participate but we feel that there should be a much larger number than the current 39.5 percent.

Mr. BARTLETT. So because of the changes in some of the regulations and some changes in some of the administrative overhead, the net effect would be an 8.3-percent increase for the handicapped?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Right. Now, you also asked me about the disadvantaged. Currently, programs for the disadvantaged, under the fiscal year 1984 budget for vocational education receive about $141.3 million. Our set-aside of 20 percent, which would also go against the total allocation to the State would raise the current amount by 2.3 percent. The amount available for the disadvantaged would raise in fiscal year 1985, if our legislation became reality, to $174.6 million.

We have heard from many sources in Congress and from the disadvantaged communities, from depressed areas, and from urban and rural areas that we should be doing more for the handicapped and this is our response for the disadvantaged as well as the handicapped.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that Mr. Goodling and perhaps others may offer an amendment on the total size of the funding in the committee or in the subcommittee to substitute instead of the $1.5 billion which is in H.R. 4164, a "such sums" figure. Would "such sums" language be the kind of suitable language that the administration would be able to support?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Yes, we would support that. Our proposal calls for the first year to be funded at the budget level request for 1985 and then the 4 subsequent years would be funded at "such sums as may be necessary."

Mr. BARTLETT. One of the previous witnesses had pointed out that the "Nation At Risk" had not addressed vocational education. Is that an area that should be addressed or, to flip the question around, is there room for—perhaps this is a two-part question—in addition, is there room for improvement of academics that would be applied to the work force in vocational education?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Yes, we are very much supportive of the report, "A Nation At Risk," which emphasizes the need for all students to have a good background in the basics, as I pointed out in my testimony, called "the new basics."

The National Commission on Excellence did hold hearings on education and work. They referred to vocational education and called for increased standards there, but they didn't devote a great deal of attention to it in their report. But what most people don't realize is that the administration, during the time the National Commission on Excellence was studying academic education mostly, also had a study underway with the National Academy of Science. I have here a copy of that report, Mr. Chairman, "Education for Tomorrow's Jobs," which Secretary Bell has said he feels can be for vocational education, a catalyst, promoting a national discussion, through national leadership. It has many outstanding recommendations on improving vocational education and at Secretary Bell's request, starting next month, we will be conducting 10 regional seminars throughout the Nation to inform the public about this study and we would like to share that with you if you would like it for the record.

We believe that vocational education deserves equal attention with academic education—it does in the schools as a matter of fact. If I may, I would like to quote what President Reagan said on this very topic when he spoke last June to the Annual National Leadership Conference and Skill Olympics of the Vocational-Industrial Clubs of America. Let me quote what the President said.

He said, "Each generation must realize that to achieve America's continued potential, we need all people with all of their talents working together. That's why our drive for excellence must reach every student in every school in every subject. We should see that all of our young people get a good grounding in English and literature, history, math and science and the other basics."

He went on. "But we must also recognize that our vocational education classrooms are just as important as any other and we should insist that the vocational courses we teach prepare this generation with the skills they need for real jobs," end of quote from President Reagan.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mrs. Roukema on the committee has commented that she finds it most positive in the requirement in subpart 1 in the State grant that, "Thirty percent of the funds not used for State administration be used for economic development and skilled work force training." Could you describe the programs that you would contemplate under that subpart?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Yes, we do have some excellent examples around the Nation already of economic development programs. Some have been in operation for quite a while. In fact, we did a study just a year ago that identified that there are 20 States plus Puerto Rico which have very well developed programs that they call "Quick-Start Economic Development Programs," funded through vocational education. Now some of the States are funding these with State money almost exclusively. Yet other States are funding them exclusively with Federal funds. Others were funding them with both State and Federal funds.

Oklahoma, for example, has had an economic development program through vocational education since 1968 and during that time they have conducted 447 different projects to train persons for new or developing industries in their State, they have trained 44,000-plus people during that period at a cost of $4.6 million. It's added a great deal of industry and business to rural areas, particularly, in the State of Oklahoma. I was just down there last week and visited some of those programs.

Now other States such as Illinois have what they call "the High Impact Training Service," which is a quick-start vocational education program. Kentucky has the Kentucky Industrial Training operated by the State Board for Vocational Education. Michigan has what they call "the Economic Job Development Vocational Education Program." New York has what they call, "the Short-Term Training Economic Development Program." Last year they spent $1 million of Federal funds for that program. Pennsylvania has what they characterize as "the Customized Job Training Program." Texas has "the Industrial Startup Program."

We would be very happy to provide this short report, if you would like, for the record, which details what these 20-some States are doing in economic development.

Mr. BARTLETT. Dr. Worthington, we would like to have a copy of that for the record, and also the previous booklet that you referred to. We'll include that in the record, and I personally would like to review both of those, in addition to that.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. All right.

[Summaries of this information follow:]

EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW'S JOBS

Notice: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

This report has been reviewed by a group other than the authors according to procedures approved by a Report Review Committee consisting of members of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

The National Research Council was established by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and of advising the federal government. The Council operates in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy under the authority of its congressional charter of 1863, which establishes the Academy as a private, nonprofit, self-governing membership corporation. The Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in the conduct of their services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. It is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. The National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine were established in 1964 and 1970, respectively, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences.

This project has been funded with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number 300-81-0306. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. government.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS PUBLICATION DATA

National Research Council (U.S.). Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education.

Committee on Vocational Education and Economic Development in Depressed Areas. Education for tomorrow's jobs.

Bibliography: p.

1. Socially handicapped youth—Education—United States. 2. Vocational education—Economic aspects—United States. 3. Socially handicapped youth—Employment—United States. 4. Industry and education—Economic aspects—United States. I. Sherman, Susan W. II. Title.

LC4091.N367 1983 370.19'31 83-17304 ISBN 0-309-03392-6

COMMITTEE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN DEPRESSED AREAS

Colin C. Blaydon (*Chair*), Vice Provost, Duke University.

William A. Morrill (*Vice Chair*), Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Princeton, N.J.

Charles S. Benson, Department of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Charles E. Bradford, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Washington, D.C.

Pat Choate, TRW, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Pedro Garza, SER-Jobs for Progress, Dallas, Tex.

James M. Howell, First National Bank of Boston.

Janice Madden, Department of Regional Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Paul E. Peterson, Committee on Public Policy Studies, University of Chicago.

George R. Quarles, Office of Occupational and Career Education, New York City Board of Education.

Wilson C. Riles, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

Isabel V. Sawhill, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Richard F. Schubert, Bethlehem Steel, Bethlehem, Pa.

Francis T. Tuttle, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Stillwater.

David A. Wise, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Susan W. Sherman, Study Director.

Barbara A. Malone, Administrative Secretary.

SUMMARY

Unemployment among young people is a serious and persistent problem in this country. Unemployment rates are especially high among members of minority groups, for high-school dropouts, and in economically depressed areas. The structural changes in the economy in the past 40 years have far-reaching implications for the skills that young workers will need and for the education and training that will increase their employability. Vocational education and other training programs can help to alleviate the problem of unemployment among America's young people. And a close link between schools and employers can help ensure that vocational education programs are teaching students the skills that employers will need.

Vocational education is a vital part of the public education system in this country, one that has long been slighted in favor of academic education. Basic academic as well as occupational skills are of fundamental importance in preparing young people for productive lives in our society. The public elementary and secondary schools in this country should offer students who will not go to college a thorough grounding not only in language skills, reasoning, and mathematics, but also in the mechanical and technical skills and work habits that will prepare them for working life. This responsibility should not be shifted to private-sector employers, although employers can help significantly in ways we outline in the report.

Evaluations of vocational education and other employment training programs lead to the conclusion that some vocational education programs do improve the employability of graduates. But the quality of vocational education programs overall is highly variable and the access of disadvantaged students to good programs is not ensured.

The committee recommends expanded collaboration between vocational educators and private-sector employers as well as improved coordination between vocational education and employment training programs. Well designed work experience programs help to improve occupational skills and to open employment opportunities for vocational education students. We recommend several changes intended to strengthen the capabilities of teachers of vocational education: changes in certification requirements, pre-service and in-service training, use of part-time teachers, and pay scales of teachers. We recommend three policy changes to improve the financing of vocational education programs: modifications in the formulas for funding programs, strategies for pooling equipment, and supplementary funding for program improvement. Because of our concern about the limited access of disadvantaged students to high-quality programs, we also recommend experimentation with vocational incentive grants to individual students, which they could use to purchase the training they desire, and attention to consumer protection in vocational education programs.

A Study of Quick-Start Economic Development Programs

VII. SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this study to determine the extent to which State boards for vocational education are making use of quick-start economic development programs, and whether or not these programs are having any real impact on economic development. The State directors of vocational education in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico were contacted. The data indicate that less than half of the States (20 States and Puerto Rico) have quick-start economic development programs. Other States such as Colorado and Wisconsin that did not meet the criteria for quick-start economic development programs are carrying out numerous types of quick-start activities under less formalized arrangements. Most quick-start economic development programs are located in the Southern and Midwestern States.

State funds accounted for most of the money going to support quick-start economic development programs. The amount of funds from State sources ranged from $32,531 in Kansas to nearly $4,000,000 in Ohio. The range in Federal funds for the support of quick-start programs was from $25,000 in Puerto Rico to $1,518,112 in Ohio. In terms of total dollars, the range was from $100,000 in Idaho to over $7,000,000 in Ohio. Of the 20 States and Puerto Rico, over half exceeded a million dollars in support of quick-start programs.

A majority of the quick-start economic development programs identified in the study served 1,000 or more people per year. There were, however, variations among States in numbers of persons being served. The numbers of persons reported being served varied from 96 in Kansas to 59,901 in Ohio.

There is as much variation in the programs as there is in the funding and the numbers of persons being served. Some of the programs are set up to serve only new and expanding businesses and industries, while others aid existing businesses and industries as well. The services they offer differ markedly.

Of the 21 State directors of vocational education surveyed, all said their programs have had significant impact on economic development. More elaborate research will probably be needed in this area.

As noted in the introduction, the present study is extremely limited in scope. Nonetheless, it does bring out certain implications for State vocational education administrators and planners who are interested in developing training programs to meet the particular needs of businesses and industries.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I add one thing? You said that the person who testified thought it might detract from their program. You have to keep in mind that our proposal calls for 30 percent for economic development, skilled work force development, 30 percent for program improvement. So, if you add 30 and 30, that leaves you 40 percent. The States will have flexibility, 40 percent less whatever they spent for State administration. They would have a great deal of flexibility. If they wanted to use that 40 percent for program improvement, they could do that.

The only thing that we are suggesting, and we feel it's appropriate, that at least 30 percent would go to economic development. Because that's what this administration believes in, getting our economic program back on the track, and developing jobs and having a skilled work force to do those jobs.

Mr. BARTLETT. One suggestion that may be made would be to note the cooperative education and work study that are included in a separate subpart 2, and my question would be, would you see any merit to including those two activities in subpart 1, since they seem to be—to serve the same function, of linking training with the private sector.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. I don't think we'd have any objection. We believe they are both very, very important programs. We estimated last year—I could give you the exact figure, if you want it—that 719,541 students were involved in vocational cooperative education programs. And the work study program is a little different program. It sometimes uses public sites and the like. But they are both very, very important programs and we support them wholeheartedly.

Whatever section it appeared in would be fine with us, as long as it's there.

Mr. BARTLETT. One other line of questioning, Dr. Worthington, on paperwork and related activities, paperwork and overregulations that we at this side, and I know at your side of the table hear a lot about, in terms of schools being required to spend a good deal of their resources filling out paperwork and filling out forms, and not in teaching students.

Does the bill that you proposed propose any changes in that paperwork burden in any significant manner, and if so, could you give us some examples of those changes?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Yes, sir. Our bill would significantly reduce the paperwork burden. In the first place, it completely removes one of the major nemeses of the local administrator. I can recall when I was a state administrator in the State of Utah I had to send out a stack of forms that high [indicating] to collect data for each of our institutions in the vocational education data system. We feel there are ways to get the data that Congress needs without having that burdensome system.

We also feel that by eliminating many of the prescriptive State planning requirements, eliminating the report that they have to file every year on accountability, we would replace that by a much more simplified report, which we have given a different heading, a "Proposed Use Report."

Our Proposed Use Report would have some requirements they'd have to meet. But much less than we do presently.

Mr. BARTLETT. Dr. Worthington, I would inquire as to whether you would be available or someone on your staff, to make sure that, in particular, the improvements that you've made in the reduction of paperwork and in reporting requirements, and in application requirements that we're certain that at least this committee considers including those in the final bill that finally passes through here, and I would personally seek your assistance.

I hear from administrators and teachers all the time, that they can document the number of hours that they're not allowed to spend in the classroom teaching because of the paperwork burden. I recall meeting with the director of vocational education in the Corpus Christi Independent School District about a week ago, and I asked her what her biggest headache was, and she pointed to an entire file cabinet and she said, "Here are the forms," and she brought out reams and reams for just 1 year, "Here are the forms that I have to fill out detailing a great deal of just simply demographic information about every student in every program in Corpus Christi ISD, in vocational education," and I said, "Well, after you fill these out and send them in, what happens? What happens differently next year because the Federal Government now knows all the demographic information and you've spent thousands of hours preparing those forms?" And she says, "Nothing. There is no difference. It doesn't make any difference. There is nothing that happens that's different or that's better as a result of filling them out. The only thing that happens is there's some student out there that's not getting as good an instruction level because my teachers are having to fill out these forms."

So, I would think that those are the kinds of things we might be able to simply eliminate.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. Well, as you know, the administration is committed to reducing paperwork and regulatory burden and we feel that our legislative proposal will go a long way toward reducing much of that unnecessary paperwork.

Mr. BARTLETT. When you kept the set asides for handicapped, which I support, do you—did you make any changes in current law, in current regulations, on the use of the set-asides for excess costs? Is it still defined the same way or do you have any proposals that would reduce that definition or reduce that regulatory burden of trying to define what is an excess cost and what's not?

Dr. WORTHINGTON. That has been a controversial issue in the past, and because of the fact our Vocational Education Act is up for reauthorization, we thought it would be appropriate to wait until the reauthorization occurs, and then respond to the requirements that Congress will put upon us in our deregulation development.

Mr. BARTLETT. Dr. Worthington, as one member of the committee and of Congress who tends to like to say in law what it is we mean to be done, I may be coming to you to see if there are some—I support the excess cost concept, by the way. But it seems to me there may be some easier and less time consuming ways to arrive at the definition of excess cost.

At this point I see that Mr. Hayes has joined us, and we have, as I hear, 15 minutes before a vote. And if Mr. Hayes has any questions or comments, I would like to turn it over to him.

Mr. HAYES. I don't have any questions, Mr. Bartlett. Thank you. That concludes the hearing.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Dr. Worthington. We appreciate your testimony and the research that you've done and we look forward to working with you.

Dr. WORTHINGTON. It's a pleasure. We'll provide the materials you've asked for, for the record.

[Whereupon, at 2:50 p.m., February 9, 1984, the hearing recessed, pursuant to the call of the Chair.]

[Additional information supplied for the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. FOFO I.F SUNIA, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF AMERICAN SAMOA

I would like to submit to you my support for reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act. In so doing, I would like to highlight several portions of that legislation that affect the territory I represent, American Samoa. It is important to express to you the application of these vocational education funds to show how useful they have been to American Samoa.

Currently, my territory receives the minimal funding of $430,400 under this act. That money is utilized for several different programs. We receive it under the Adult Education State Administration Program, the Basic Grants to States Program, Consumer and Homemaking Education, Vocational Education Improvement and Services, Special Programs for Disadvantaged, the Vocational Education State Advisory Council and finally for State Planning and Evaluation. These seven programs have been very useful to us and a decision against reauthorization could delete an already modest vocational education program.

Just this past week I learned that one of our two major employers will be conducting a six month lay-off. All indications are that even if this factory does resume operations it will continue to show an unpredictable future for its workers. This is a very good reason for continued assistance with vocational education. The labor force of American Samoa needs the well rounded and practical experience these programs can provide, so that we are not totally dependent upon one skill area.

I also would like to join other territorial representatives in opposing subsection (f) of Section 402 of H.R. 4164. This section gives the Secretary of Education the discretionary authority to pay the territorial advisory councils less than the minimum amount payable to other jurisdictions.

Further, I propose that Puerto Rico be removed from consideration with the other territories in sharing the allotment ratio of .60. I understand that Puerto Rico, like many other jurisdictions, will most likely have enormous vocational education needs. However, because of Puerto Rico's large population, I feel that .60 can barely cover expenses for new and continuing vocational—educational programs in all the territories if Puerto Rico were included.

I commend the efforts of this Subcommittee and extrol your motivation in making vocational education an equal partner in our economy, American Samoa's programs are limited in scope, but the support from this act has not limited many opportunities for those who have been its direct beneficiaries.

ALEUTIAN REGION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Anchorage, AK, February 28, 1984.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Last week two seventy million dollar satellites failed to function after being lifted into orbit by one of the technological marvels of our day. The malfunction seemed to be due to a problem with a rather insignificant minor component. Each day communication with the six extremely remote communities we serve in the Aleutians occurs through satellites and the earth stations now found in each community. Minor problems with the earth stations, transmission equipment, or the telephones themselves requires a "service call" by technicians whose round trip travel, alone, may run from two to four thousand dollars.

Why do I cite such events to members of this nation's congressional delegation? Because, as a school teacher and administrator for over thirty years I am increas-

ingly concerned about the quality and commitment of the work force found in our country today. Pride in one's work and a critical concern for the final product on the part of all who worked upon it might have avoided the malfunctioning of the multi-million dollar satellites now apparently lost forever. Appropriate education and training, at least in trouble shooting, of some people in our Aleutian communities could save thousands of dollars yearly in minor, but necessary, repair and maintenance problems. Delays and the loss of vital communication may have a value or non-monetary cost which it is impossible to estimate.

One way we may be able to bring quality back into our work ethic and our production is to give all of America's youth an opportunity to be exposed to the benefits of appropriate and effective vocational education. In my opinion, the Vocational Technical Education Act reauthorization represented by H.R. 4164 may help to do that. My review of its provisions indicates that it improves as well as continues the important elements of previous laws. I am particularly pleased with its emphasis upon public and business-industry participation in giving the program direction and support.

John Gardner once stated that a nation which settled for mediocrity from either its plumbers or its philosophers would have neither theories nor pipes which would hold water. I urge you to support legislation in support of vocational education. I believe that our nation was founded on principles which called for all persons—philosophers, plumbers, politicians and educators—to understand and support the value of those common and technical skills by which our country has grown and remained free.

I hope that you will see fit to not only support H.R. 4164, but also to support or demand that the nation's schools utilize this federal funding, as it is meant to be, as the impetus to educational programs which truly represent the needs of our country and its people.

Sincerely yours,

DICK H. BOWER, *Superintendent*

98TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4793

To consolidate existing Federal vocational education programs, to simplify requirements for States and other recipients participating in Federal vocational education programs, and to authorize certain State and national programs for the development of vocational skills in the work force that will improve productivity and economic growth, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 8, 1984

Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To consolidate existing Federal vocational education programs, to simplify requirements for States and other recipients participating in Federal vocational education programs, and to authorize certain State and national programs for the development of vocational skills in the work force that will improve productivity and economic growth, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

PART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) The purpose of this Act is to authorize State and national programs which will promote economic development by: (1) addressing the needs of youth and adults, in all communities, for vocational education; (2) strengthening the ability of State and local systems of vocational education to promote and respond to economic development; (3) enhancing equal educational opportunity in vocational education for all students, including those with special needs such as the handicapped, the educationally disadvantaged, and those with limited English proficiency; (4) overcoming sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education; (5) addressing the national need of employers for a skilled and literate work force; (6) addressing the training needs of displaced workers; and (7) coordinating with other programs of training and employment to ensure the most efficient use of resources.

(b) It is the intent of Congress that States participating in programs authorized by part B of this Act be afforded broad discretionary authority in planning, developing, administering, coordinating and operating those programs.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are authorized to be appropriated $731,314,000 for

fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1986 through 1989.

(b) Funds appropriated by the first section of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, 39 Stat. 929, as amended) shall be considered as funds appropriated pursuant to this section.

SET-ASIDE FOR NATIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 103. From the amount appropriated pursuant to section 102 for any fiscal year the Secretary may set-aside up to 5 per centum of that amount for national programs under section 130.

STATE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 104. (a) Subject to section 103, the Secretary shall allot the funds appropriated under section 102 to each State for each fiscal year in the following amounts—

(1) 40 per centum according to the ratio which the product of the State's allotment ratio and the sum of the State's population aged fifteen through nineteen and the number of unemployed persons in the State aged fifteen through nineteen bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States;

(2) 40 per centum according to the ratio which the product of the State's allotment ratio and the sum of the State's population aged twenty through forty-four and the number of unemployed persons in the

State aged twenty through forty-four bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; and

(3) 20 per centum according to the ratio which the product of the State's allotment ratio and the sum of the State's population aged forty-five through sixty-four and the number of unemployed persons in the State aged forty-five through sixty-four bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b)(1) The allotment ratio of a State, other than an insular area, for any fiscal year is one minus one half of the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (excluding the insular areas).

(2) The allotment ratio of an insular area is 0.6.

(3) The Secretary shall compute allotment ratios on the basis of the average of the appropriate per capita incomes for the three most recent fiscal years for which data, satisfactory to the Secretary, exist.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall allot to each State—

(A) for fiscal year 1985, no less than 90 per centum of the amount it received under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (other than section 105 of that Act) for fiscal year 1984;

35-667 O - 84 - 8

(B) for fiscal year 1986, no less than 85 per centum of the amount it received under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (other than section 105 of that Act) for fiscal year 1984;

(C) for fiscal year 1987, no less than 80 per centum of the amount it received under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (other than section 105 of that Act) for fiscal year 1984; and

(D) for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, no less than $100,000.

(2) Amounts required to comply with paragraph (1) shall be derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of all other States, subject to adjustments needed to avoid reducing any State below the minimum amount.

(3) If insufficient funds are appropriated to comply with paragraph (1), the allotment of each State shall be reduced proportionately.

(d)(1) The Secretary may reallot all or a portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year if the State does not submit a Proposed Use Report under section 105, or indicates to the Secretary that it does not need the full amount of its allotment for that fiscal year. The Secretary may fix one or more dates during a fiscal year upon which to make reallotments.

(2) The Secretary may reallot funds on a competitive basis to one or more States that demonstrate a current need for additional funds under this Act. Any funds reallotted to another State shall be deemed to be part of its allotment for the fiscal year in which the funds are reallotted.

(e) For the purpose of determining allotments under this section—

(1) population shall be based on the latest data that are satisfactory to the Secretary;

(2) unemployed population shall be based on the average of the appropriate unemployment data for the three most recent fiscal years for which data, satisfactory to the Secretary, exists;

(3) the term "per capita income" means, for any fiscal year, the total personal income in the calendar year ending in such year, divided by the population of the area concerned in that year; and

(4) the term "insular area" means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

PROPOSED USE REPORT

SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program authorized by part B of this Act during any fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary an annual Proposed Use

Report which describes the vocational education goals the State seeks to achieve, the characteristics of the individuals to be served, how the Federal funds will be used to achieve the purposes of this Act, how the funds will be distributed within the State (including any allocation formulas to be used), and the results the State anticipates. The Proposed Use Report must designate the single State agency or instrumentality that is responsible for the administration or supervision of the administration of the State's program under part B, including its compliance with all the requirements of this Act.

(b) In addition to the information required by subsection (a), the Proposed Use Report must:

(1) describe how the State will—

(A) provide access for all vocational education students to instruction in the basic skills that are needed for employment;

(B) use funds awarded under part B to enhance equal educational opportunity in vocational education for all students, including those with special needs such as the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped, and those with limited English proficiency;

(C) use funds available under part B to overcome sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education programs; and

(D) involve the State job training coordinating council and private industry councils established under the Job Training Partnership Act, as well as other representatives from business, industry, finance, labor, and agriculture in planning and carrying out vocational education programs funded under part B so that those programs reflect the skilled labor needs of employers and current technology.

(2) contain assurances that the State will—

(A) provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of programs under this Act;

(B) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as are necessary to ensure proper disbursement and use of Federal funds paid to the State;

(C) comply with requests of the Secretary for reports that are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act;

(D) provide for the participation of students who are enrolled in private schools in programs,

projects, services, and activities at the secondary level that are supported by funds awarded under part B, consistent with State law, and the number of those students in the area to be served who share the need for vocational education which the program, project, service, or activity is designed to address;

(E) maintain continuing public administrative direction and control over funds used to provide programs, projects, services, and activities to students in a private school; and

(F) distribute funds to eligible recipients on the basis of annual applications, approved by the State, which describe the activities to be supported with Federal funds.

(c) Each Proposed Use Report must contain an assessment of the vocational education programs supported with Federal funds during the State's most recently completed program year, including an assessment of the extent to which the State met the goals established for that year.

(d) Prior to submitting it to the Secretary, the State shall make the Proposed Use Report public in a manner that facilitates comment from interested agencies, groups, and individuals.

AUDITS

SEC. 106. Each State shall obtain financial and compliance audits of any funds which the State receives under this Act. Such audits shall be made public within the State on a timely basis. The audits shall be conducted at least every two years by an organization or person independent of an agency administering activities under the Act. The audits shall be conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General's Standard for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

SEC. 107. The Secretary shall submit to Congress each fiscal year a report on the status of vocational education in the Nation. The report must contain concise analyses of the information in Proposed Use Reports under section 105, as well as other appropriate information gathered by the Secretary.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 108. (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education during the period for which funds are appropriated under section 102. The President shall appoint members of the Council for terms of three years, except that the President may select initial members of the Council for terms of one or two years. The Council shall have as a

majority of it members persons who are not educators or administrators in the field of education. The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, whom the President selects, but not less than three times a year. The Chairman of the National Commission for Employment Policy shall be a member of the Council.

(b) The National Advisory Council shall—

(1) advise the President, Congress, the Secretary, and the head of any other appropriate Federal department or agency concerning the administration of vocational education programs supported under this Act as well as the implementation of other laws that afffect vocational education, and employment and training programs;

(2) make whatever reports or recommendations to the President, Congress, the Secretary, and the head of any other appropriate Federal department or agency as are appropriate and reasonable, and include in any such report the comments of the National Commission for Employment Policy;

(3) identify, in conjunction with the National Commission for Employment Policy, the vocational education and training and employment needs of the Nation and assess the degree to which existing vocational education, training and employment, vocational

rehabilitation, adult education, special education, and other programs represent a coordinated and effective approach to meeting those needs;

(4) conduct whatever hearings, studies, or other factfinding activities are needed to enable the National Advisory Council to carry out its functions; and

(5) conduct independent evaluations of other programs conducted under this Act, and publish the results.

(c) The Council may accept gifts if their acceptance will better enable it to carry out its functions under this section.

GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 109. Only the following sections of the General Education Provisions Act shall apply to programs conducted under this Act: sections 412 (a) and (b), 415, 416, 417, 420, 422(a) (1) and (2), 426(a), 432, 433, 437, 438, 439, 440, 451, 452, 454, 455 and 456.

PART B—STATE PROGRAMS

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 120. (a) The Secretary, in accordance with the amount alloted to each State under section 104, shall make grants to the States for the purposes of establishing, expanding, and improving vocational education programs, projects, services, and activities in accordance with subparts 1 and 2.

(b) Each State shall use the amount granted under subsection (a) to carry out programs, projects, services, and activities authorized by this part in the following manner—

(1) first, the State may set aside that portion of the amount granted under subsection (a) required for the State's administration of the programs, projects, services, and activities described in its Proposed Use Report; and

(2) from the remainder, the State shall use—

(A) no less than 30 per centum to carry out programs, projects, services, and activities authorized by subpart 1; and

(B) no less than 30 per centum to carry out programs, projects, services, and activities authorized by subpart 2.

(c)(1) A State shall use (A) no less than 10 per centum of the funds under subsection (b)(2) to meet the special needs of handicapped persons, and (B) no less than 20 per centum of the funds under subsection (b)(2) to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged persons.

(2) A State may use funds under subsection (b)(2) to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of an eligible recipient's administration of programs, projects, services, and activities described in its approved annual application.

(d) A State may use funds granted under subsection (a) to pay for the cost of any State or local advisory council which assists the planning, implementation, or evaluation of a program, project, service, or activity under this Act.

(e) A State may not use funds granted under subsection (a) to pay the cost of stipends or construction.

ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS

SEC. 121. (a) A State may use the funds received under section 120 directly, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with eligible recipients, for the purpose of carrying out programs, projects, services, and activities authorized by this part.

(b) A State may prescribe the manner in which grants and contracts are made to eligible recipients and may prescribe whatever terms, consistent with Federal requirements, are reasonable and necessary for the proper and efficient administration of programs, projects, services, and activities authorized by this part.

Subpart 1—Economic Development and Skilled Work Force Training

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 122. It is the purpose of this subpart to assist States to provide vocational education programs, projects, services, and activities that foster State and local economic development by training persons, including displaced work-

ers, in the occupational skills needed by business and industry. Skilled work force training conducted under this subpart must correspond to current State or local economic needs or plans that are specifically described in the Proposed Use Report.

AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

SEC. 123. (a) In order to achieve the purposes of this subpart, a State shall, in accordance with section 120(b)(2)(A), use funds for one or more of the following—

(1) retraining persons whose jobs have been lost or jeopardized by technological or economic change for occupations in which there is a current or projected shortage of workers;

(2) training for skilled occupations needed to revitalize businesses and industries that are essential to State or local economic well-being;

(3) training for skilled occupations which are needed to attract or otherwise promote the entry of new businesses and industries into a State or community;

(4) conducting applied research and developing information for dissemination to the public on occupational skills in emerging or rapidly changing trades, crafts, businesses, and industries, including activities carried

out in cooperation with the National or State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee;

(5) developing new curricula or innovative pilot programs for emerging or rapidly changing trades, crafts, businesses, and industries;

(6) providing vocational education for persons who are out of school, unemployed, and who live in an economically depressed area;

(7) training or retraining vocational education instructors (through exchange programs between business or industry and the school, where feasible);

(8) improving the quality of vocational education courses leading to the development of a skilled work force through the acquisition or replacement of equipment;

(9) providing training in entrepreneurship and the skills necessary for entrepreneurship; and

(10) providing any vocational education program, project, service, or activity that promotes the purposes of this subpart.

(b) Each State and eligible recipient shall give careful consideration to the needs of persons described in subsection (a)(1) by making its best efforts to recruit those persons for participation in the programs, projects, services, and activities supported with funds under this subpart.

Subpart 2—Strengthening State and Local Systems of Vocational Education

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 124. It is the purpose of this subpart to strengthen State and local systems of vocational education so that all persons, regardless of sex (including handicapped persons, educationally disadvantaged persons, and persons with limited English proficiency), can participate in vocational education programs that are designed to provide needed job skills and foster economic development.

AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

SEC. 125. In order to achieve the purpose of this subpart a State shall, in accordance with section 120(b)(2)(B), use funds for one or more of the following—

(1) strengthening State and local vocational education systems by promoting the active participation of representatives from business, industry, labor, finance, and agriculture in vocational education through joint training programs and shared facilities, and by coordinating these programs with programs under the Job Training Partnership Act;

(2) providing necessary support services (except stipends) for vocational education students, including students preparing to obtain employment in occupations traditionally associated with members of the op-

posite sex, current or former homemakers seeking employment, and single heads of households who lack adequate job skills;

(3) providing programs, projects, services, and activities designed to reduce sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education, including the support of full-time personnel to assist the State in achieving sex equity in all its vocational education programs;

(4) providing cooperative vocational education programs involving agreements between schools and employers;

(5) providing vocational education programs, projects, services, and activities designed to meet the special needs of persons with limited English proficiency;

(6) providing work study programs which address the vocational education needs of economically disadvantaged students;

(7) providing remedial instruction in basic skills for vocational education students who need it to benefit from vocational instruction;

(8) providing new training courses for adults who wish to improve current occupational skills or who wish to develop skills for new careers;

(9) strengthening secondary and postsecondary programs and projects to provide high quality instruc-

tion in new or developing trades, crafts, or occupations that are technologically demanding;

(10) improving the quality of vocational education in the most economical manner possible through the acquisition or replacement of equipment and necessary minor remodeling of vocational education facilities;

(11) providing programs for the occupation of homemaker (consumer and homemaking education);

(12) providing industrial arts and pre-vocational guidance programs;

(13) providing support to vocational student organizations that are an integral part of a vocational education program;

(14) providing career guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up services, including use of the Employment Service, as appropriate;

(15) providing vocational education programs, projects, services, and activities for incarcerated persons nearing their release; and

(16) providing any vocational education program, project, service, or activity that meets the purposes of this subpart.

PART C—NATIONAL PROGRAMS

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 130. The Secretary shall use funds set aside under section 103 to support one or more of the programs, projects, services, or activities authorized by sections 131, 132, 133, and 134. In any fiscal year the Secretary may use these funds for particular types of programs, projects, services, or activities authorized by these sections.

RESEARCH

SEC. 131. (a) The Secretary may support directly, or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public or private institutions, agencies, or organizations, one or more of the following—

(1) research and development activities on problems of national significance in vocational education;

(2) studies addressing national problems, such as defense preparedness, that are caused by shortages of skilled workers;

(3) the collection and dissemination of information on research and program improvement activities in vocational education;

(4) the collection of information to facilitate national planning and policy development in vocational education; and

(5) the development of State and local leadership resources in vocational education.

(b) The Secretary may support a National Center for Research in Vocational Education to conduct one or more of the activities authorized under subsection (a).

PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 132. (a) The Secretary may, upon the request of any Indian tribe that is eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination Act or under the Act of April 16, 1934, make one or more grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with a tribal organization of that Indian tribe to plan, conduct, and administer vocational education programs, projects, services, and activities that are authorized by part B of this Act and are consistent with tribal economic development plans.

(b) The Secretary shall review applications and award funds under subsection (a) on a competitive basis.

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DATA SYSTEM

SEC. 133. The Secretary may extend financial and technical assistance to support the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee established under section 464 of the Job Training Partnership Act.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FOR MEETING NATIONAL SKILLED WORK FORCE NEEDS

SEC. 134. The Secretary may support directly, or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public or private institutions, agencies, or organizations, one or more of the following—

(1) the development, demonstration, evaluation, validation, and dissemination of exemplary job training programs and projects for persons whose jobs have been lost or jeopardized by technological or economic change;

(2) the development and demonstration of programs and projects designed to reduce sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education;

(3) the development, demonstration, evaluation, and dissemination of skilled work force training programs and projects (including the curricula for such programs or projects) for rapidly changing occupations or occupations necessary for economic development;

(4) the development and demonstration of collaborative vocational education programs and projects that combine the resources of business, industry, labor, education, finance, agriculture, and public and private training and employment programs;

(5) the development of vocational education programs and projects that incorporate the principles of entrepreneurship;

(6) the development, demonstration, and evaluation of programs and projects designed to train or retrain vocational education instructors through exchanges between business or industry and the schools;

(7) the development, demonstration, and evaluation of programs or projects designed to expand the use of volunteers in providing vocational education;

(8) the improvement of rural vocational education and rural family education;

(9) special training programs and projects, developed independently or in combination with other public or private training programs, designed to address critical shortages of skilled workers which the Nation requires;

(10) joint planning and coordination of programs and activities supported under this Act (or other laws that affect vocational education and training and employment programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act) with other Federal departments and agencies as well as representatives of business and industry, labor unions, and education and training organizations; and

(11) other programs or projects, including technical assistance and training, that are consistent with the purposes of this Act, and designed to support the efforts of States to improve the overall quality of the vocational education they provide.

PART D—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 140. As used in this Act:

(1) The term "acquisition" means taking ownership of property, receiving property as a gift, entering into a lease-purchase arrangement, or leasing the property. The term includes processing, delivery, and installation of property.

(2) The term "administration" means those activities of a State or eligible recipient that are reasonable and necessary for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this Act, including State supervision, and the development of the Proposed Use Report.

(3) The term "construction" includes the construction of new buildings, the acquisition, expansion, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading, improvement, and architect fees. The term does not include minor remodeling needed to accommodate equipment used for instructional purposes.

(4) The term "educationally disadvantaged" means, when used with respect to an individual, a

person who has one or more academic deficiencies (such as inadequate writing, reading, or mathematical skills) and who therefore requires special services and assistance in order to succeed in vocational education programs.

(5) The term "eligible recipient" means a public or private agency, organization, or institution capable of administering a vocational education program. The term may include public corporations and community-based organizations.

(6) The term "handicapped" means, when used with respect to an individual, a person who is mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired person, or a person with specific learning disabilities, who by reason thereof requires special education and related services, and who, because of that person's handicapping condition, cannot succeed in the regular vocational education program without special education assistance or who requires a modified vocational education program.

(7) The term "limited English proficiency," with reference to an individual, means a person—

(A)(i) who was not born in the United States;

(ii) whose native language is other than English; or

(iii) who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and

(B) who therefore has substantial difficulty understanding, speaking, reading, or writing English.

(8) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(9) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(10) The term "vocational education" means an organized instructional program that is directly related to the preparation of persons for employment, paid or unpaid, in an occupation that does not require a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

PART E—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; REPEALS; EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 150. (a) The Job Training Partnership Act is amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) by amending paragraph (14) to read as follows:

"(14) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.";

(B) by amending paragraph (23) to read as follows:

"(23) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary or secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law."; and

(C) by striking out in paragraph (28) "section 195(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963." and inserting in lieu thereof "section 140(a)(10) of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984.".

(2) Part B of title I of such Act is amended—

(A) in section 122(a) by striking out paragraph (8);

(B) in section 122(b)(7)—

(i) by striking out subparagraph (B); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as paragraph (7);

(C) in section 122(b)(8) by inserting "(including an annual review and comment on the Proposed Use Report under section 105 of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act)" after "agencies" in the first clause; and

(D) in section 125(b)(1) by striking out "the Vocational Education Act of 1963," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984,".

(3) Part A of title IV of such Act is amended in section 427(a)(1) by striking out "section 104(a)(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 105(a) of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

(4) Part E of title IV of such Act is amended—

(A) in section 461(c) by striking out "the Vocational Education Act of 1963," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984,";

(B) in section 463(a) by striking out "under section 161(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963," and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 464 of this Act,"; and

(C) in section 464—

(i) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There is established a National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (hereinafter referred to in this section as "the Committee") which shall serve as the successor to the entity previously established under section 161(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Membership of the Committee shall include the Assistant Secretary of Education for Vocational and Adult Education, the Administrator of the National Center for Education Statistics, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics.

"(2) Of the amounts available for this part for each fiscal year, not more than $5,000,000 is authorized to be reserved for the Committee. Not less than 75 per centum of the funds transferred by the Secretary to the Committee shall be used to support State Occupational Information Coordinating

Committees and other organizational units designated under section 125 of the joint Training Partnership Act for carrying out State labor market information programs.";

(ii) by striking out in subsection (b) "In addition to its responsibilities under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee shall—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In addition to any responsibilities that the Secretary of Education may impose on the Committee under the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984, the Committee shall—"; and

(iii) by striking out in subsection (c) "the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under this Act, under section 161 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and under section 12 of the Career Education Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Committee under this Act, and under section 133 of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984,".

(5) Part F of title IV of such Act is amended—

(A) in section 472(a) by striking out "(established under section 162 of the Vocational Educa-

tion Act of 1963)." and inserting in lieu thereof "(established under section 108 of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984)."; and

(B) in section 473(7)(B) by striking out "section 162 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963;" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 108 of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984;".

(b) Section 703(a)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "section 122(a)(4)(C) and part J of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and".

(c) Section 306(b)(11) of the Adult Education Act is amended by striking out "the Vocational Education Act of 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

(d)(1) Section 113(d) and 114(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are each amended by striking out "the Vocational Education Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

(2) Section 1022(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by strikig out "the Vocational Education Act of 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

(e) The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) in section 211(a) by striking out in the second sentence "the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 403)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the appropriate provisions of the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984"; and

(2) in section 214(c) by striking out "Vocational Education Act of 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

(f) Section 101(a)(11) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended by striking out "the Vocational Education Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Vocational Education Consolidation Act of 1984".

SEC. 151. (a) The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is hereby repealed on the effective date of this Act.

(b) Funds appropriated for use during fiscal years 1984 or 1985 under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 that are not obligated by July 1, 1985 by a State or other recipient shall remain available for obligation in accordance with the requirements of this Act.

(c) In order to effect a smooth transition to the consolidated program authorized in this Act, the Secretary may, prior to the effective date of this Act, promulgate regulations,

establish dates for the receipt of Proposed Use Reports under section 105, and take other actions he deems necessary.

(d) This Act shall take effect July 1, 1985.